Caroline Tissot

Everyday citizenship: investigating feelings about integration among permanent residents and naturalized citizens in Norway

NTNU

Norwegian University of
Science and Technology

ABSTRACT

This thesis looks at how three different aspects of citizenship, namely legal status, rights and emotions, influence on long-term permanent residents, here defined as denizens, and naturalized citizens' integration in Norway. For that, it adopted a perspective that assumes that citizenship is a concept that can also be constructed from below, being an everyday practice and built by the participants of this study. The research was developed through data collected via semi-structured in depth interviews, with 10 highly skilled participants that reside in Trondheim, Norway. The main concepts that emerged from the participants' definitions were related to belonging, identity, emotions, rights, practicalities, integration and the idea of 'othering'. Those who have acquired a Norwegian citizenship legal status emphasized that their life became easier after they did so, although their everyday lives remained mostly the same as they were before they had the legal status. The acquisition also did not influence on how they are accepted and perceived within the Norwegian society. The denizens did not feel the need to change to the Norwegian citizenship, because they can live a regular life in Norway even without having it. Besides that, by keeping their birth citizenship, they can stay active in both countries – in the one they reside, Norway, and in the one they were born hence gain the best of two worlds. Their answers and definitions, combined with the contextual and theoretical frameworks, emphasized the need of having integration policies going beyond providing good structures and practical support; people under emotional constraint need to have their emotions acknowledged and addressed if the integration project is meant to be fully successful and to result in a process that happens through the cooperation of all the actors involved.

Key-words: citizenship, naturalization, denizens, emotions, feelings, integration, belonging, identity.

"Even more frightening than the physical walls, are the walls they are building between our hearts"

Shirin Ebadi, Nobel Peace Prize Winner, during the International Student Festival in Trondheim, 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) states, in its First Article, that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights" (UN, 1948, p. 2), and that every individual has the right to free movement, including residence in another country, and to return to his/her country of origin. Mobility is fundamental to human freedom since it entails the opportunity to seek for life improvement, education, employment and to live in safer places. As free movement, every human being should also be granted the right to a nationality (UNDP, 2010).

Hence it is possible to suggest that every person has the right to exercise mobility and to hold a citizenship[1], even though this combination may raise a "paradoxical geographical imagination" (Cresswell, 2010, p. 263). It is a paradox because, at the same time it refers to an individual who is attached to a place (e.g. the nation state), holding a membership, and thus brings an idea of a sedentary lifestyle, it emphasises freedom of movement.

By moving more and more often, individuals seem to identify with more places and raise different struggles, challenging the known structures and processes and, more than that, emotions and feelings that people have towards 'home', which can become a blurred concept for some. As Castles & Davidson (2010) state, "millions of people are disenfranchised because they cannot become citizens in their country of residence […]. There are increasing numbers of citizens who do not belong" (2010, p. viii). These processes lead to discrimination and marginalization, increasing inequality and social exclusion of minorities, formation of ethnic groups and violence. Adds to this the rise of fear by the population and the questioning about loyalty by the state towards migrants (Isin, 2009; Staeheli et. al, 2012).

In Norway, concerns about shared loyalty is a central argument for one not to have dual citizenship (still there are some exceptions) and "according to the Government, Norwegian citizenship should not be easily obtained, and the conditions for its acquisition shall contribute to ensuring that new citizens are active participants in Norwegian society" (IMO, 2016, p. 99). Still, immigration to Norway continues to grow, while naturalization rates are decreasing. If people migrate to Norway because of the 'Nordic Welfare Model' as some argue (Hvinden &

---

[1] In international law, citizenship is often called nationality (Bauböck, 2006, p. 17). Besides that, "legal and political documents often use the terms citizenship and nationality as synonyms. […] [however] the practice in most countries is inconsistent and contradictory" (Castles & Davidson, 2000, p. 102).

Johansson, 2007), why do immigrants decide to remain as permanent residents even after living in the country for 10, 20, 30 years?

There may be something in-between-lines of citizenship legal status and its relationship with rights, duties and other key societal concepts as integration, belonging, identity and emotions that are not being considered. Most of times, citizenship is seen through its legal lenses, but how those who constitute, identify and see themselves as citizens or non-citizens negotiate, expose, perform and feel the paradoxes and nuances of this relationship in everyday life is equally important.

1.1. JUSTIFICATION FOR THE STUDY

I am a dual citizen (Brazil and Italy) and, even though I was born and raised in Brazil, I always questioned myself about how holding two passports affects who I am and how I behave. I naturally never came to an answer but it never seemed to be too much of a problem; my country of origin is characterized by being diverse, by having multiple languages and it was 'formed' by immigrants. When it comes to appearance, I would say anyone could be Brazilian because we all look so different from each other, at the same time we are so many[2].

When I came to live in Norway, in August 2015, I was surprised in many ways, and perhaps because it was just *so* different from what I was used to: how society works, how people relate to each other, how similar people look, the way the state works, and many other things. I specifically remember I did not expect such an advanced country in so many ways to not allow dual citizenship, because I always *took it for granted*. By then, I started to ask myself why would someone decide to renounce (or not) on his/ her citizenship to obtain a new one. Beyond that, how obtaining a new citizenship would influence someone's understanding and performance as a citizen. I shall say citizenship always had a very emotional content for me; being a citizen, representing a country can be very powerful. But how does that happen? Is it through the passport? Is it the most prominent element of citizenship or is it just a tool, a thing that gives us access?

---

[2] Just to provide an overview, by the end of 2016, the population in Brazil was 205.824.000 (Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics, IBGE), while in Norway it was 5.258.000 (Statistics Norway, SSB).

As it will be possible to see in the further sections, these are not the research questions of this thesis, but they were my initial questionings and what motivated me to study this topic. Since I am studying the participants' feelings in this thesis, I found proper to add mine too.

From a research angle, the literature on citizenship is growing and is acquiring different perspectives in the recent decades (Isin & Turner, 2002). When it comes to a citizenship definition, the idea that individuals physically belong somewhere is still predominant even though it is being challenged by different actors (Sassen, 2005) and has acquired a personhood approach (Soysal, 1994). I question whether the central actors of this discussion - the citizens themselves – are being heard. For this reason, this study focuses on a traditionally marginalized group in any society, the immigrants (Kabeer et. al, 2005), and aims to explore how they understand and perform citizenship from an ordinary perspective (Staeheli et. al, 2012).

In this sense, I recognize that, even though citizenship is also understood by many as a given status, and is marked by the possession of legal documents and a range of civil, political and social rights (Castles & Davidson, 2010), it can also be performed and enacted by everyone, despite legal status (Isin, 2009). In fact, *acting* as a citizen may be more significant for one's daily life than *being recognized* as such, even though the latter is important for other reasons. I understand that the first case, however, is deeply connected with one's feeling towards identity, integration and belonging and the obligations with both receiving and origin countries. Moreover, this study acknowledges the importance of having everyday lenses, connected to the contexts of people, seeing mobility as a strategy that people employ to improve their own livelihoods that contributes to the formation of new identities, relationships and politics of difference (Rigg, 2007). Hence the main contribution this thesis aims to bring to existent studies is adding to the traditional view of citizenship legal status and rights the ordinary and embodied perspective. This is done by seeing it through emotional lenses, acknowledging that emotions, feelings and sentiments play a role and may influence on the perceptions and decisions people have regarding citizenship.

1.2. OBJECTIVE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The objective of this thesis is to study long-term permanent residents (denizens) and naturalized Norwegian citizens' feelings about citizenship in Norway. This will be done through exploring possible answers to the main research question of this study:

- How do three aspects of citizenship –status, rights and emotions - influence on denizens and naturalized citizens' integration in the Norwegian society?

Moreover, the sub-questions that emerged from this main research question are:

- What are the research participants' definitions of citizenship?
- How does citizenship status influence on the participants' feelings about integration and belonging?
- How do rights granted by a citizenship status influence on the participants' feelings of integration and belonging?

1.3. THESIS OUTLINE

This thesis is divided in six chapters, where:

Chapter one provides a brief introduction of the study, as well as why this thesis topic is relevant to be undertaken, with a personal motivation and an academic justification. It presents the objective of the study and its research questions, which will be addressed throughout the next chapters.

Chapter two presents the contextual framework of this thesis, and under which context it is studied. It thus presents briefly an overview of immigration to Norway and is followed by the perspective of the Norwegian Government on relevant topics for this research, such as permanent residence, naturalization, dual citizenship and integration.

Chapter three details the methodological framework, by presenting how the research process took place. It includes choice of methods, describes how participants were selected and goes through the process of data collection and analysis, ending the chapter with ethical considerations and assessing the reliability and validity of the study.

Chapter four introduces the theoretical framework of the study which was the basis for the development of this thesis. Since the main theory used here is on citizenship, this is also the most explored concept in Chapter four. Hence, citizenship and its interaction with migration, rights and subjects, and emotional citizenship are presented. Besides that, Chapter four presents the analytical approach of the study, where additional related such as integration, identity, belonging, emotions, feelings and sentiments are introduced.

Chapter five presents the findings and analysis of the study. It introduces the findings of the data collection, sub-divided in participants' perspectives about citizenship definitions, legal citizenship status' influence on participants' feelings about integration and belonging and the influence of rights granted by legal citizenship status on participants' feelings about integration and belonging.

Chapter six goes on to bring a concluding discussion to the thesis, by putting together findings, conceptual and theoretical framework and aims to address the main research question of the study. It sums up findings, discussion, assessment and suggestions for further research in this area.

2. CONTEXT

This thesis studies citizenship, immigration, integration, naturalization, topics that have long been targeted by Norway as key to the maintenance of a stable welfare state (Hagelund, 2003). Since the present study takes place within the Norwegian context, it is useful to have a contextual chapter, to provide a brief and general background on the perspective of the Norwegian Government about the above-mentioned topics. It should be noted that all the information was taken from official governmental data sources, to get to know the position and official statements of the Norwegian Government. Discussion about the presented information and association with theory and collected data will be done in Chapter Six. Hence the present chapter presents the contextualization about immigration to Norway, permanent residence, naturalization, dual citizenship and integration.

2.1. IMMIGRATION TO NORWAY

Significant numerical immigration to Norway started in the late 1960s, much later than in other Western European countries. It didn't mean, however, that high volumes were not achieved and they kept growing. According to the Norwegian government (2016), except for the year 1989, Norway has had net immigration[3] each year since the late 1960s (IMO, 2016, p. 14). Hence immigration to Norway has almost always had positive numbers, despite measures such as the 1975 Norwegian 'immigration stop', a "selective and strict regulatory system, with the aim of limiting the inflow of unskilled labor from poor countries, while simultaneously ensuring access to particular niches of the labor market" (Brochmann, 2008, p. 530). The ban worked and is still effective, although it does not apply for asylum seekers and refugees (Hagelund, 2003). Proportionally, the number of immigrants[4] and Norwegian-born to immigrant parents[5] and its percentage of the total population continues to grow. According to Statistics Norway (SSB), in 1986 they represented 3,6%, in 1996 5,6%, in 2006 8,3% and, in the latest published report, from 2017, this group represented 16,8% of the total population.

Since 2010, immigration to Norway is regulated by the *Immigration Act* of 15 May 2008[6]. According to the *Act,* its corresponding *Immigration Regulation* and an individual assessment which is followed by both, a person is eligible to immigrate to Norway and hold a residence

---

[3] 'Immigration' is defined by the government as to include persons who have legally moved to Norway with the intention of staying 6 months or more (IMO, 2016, p. 14).

[4] Persons born abroad of two foreign-born parents and four foreign-born grandparents (SSB, 2017, 10.03).

[5] Persons born in Norway of two foreign-born parents and four foreign- born grandparents (SSB, 2017, 10.03).

[6] It should be noted that this was not the law when participants came to Norway, even because they arrived in the country in different years. Nevertheless, the purpose of the study to explore different regulations across time.

permit if he/she is: a labor migrant with a concrete job offer; a person with close family ties to someone residing in the country; a student, a trainee, an *au pair* or an exchange program participant; a refugee or a person who qualifies for residence permit on humanitarian grounds. The duration of the permit, what it includes (e.g. right to work) and its limitations (e.g. limit of working hours per week) vary according to the category and may change depending on personal circumstances (IMO, 2016, p. 13).

2.2. PERMANENT RESIDENCE

In general, a first-time residence permit is granted before the entry takes place and it lasts for at least one year (up to three). A permanent residence permit (including rights of both residence and work) is usually granted after three years of continuous residence (excluding days outside the country for trips, both personal or business), in case "certain conditions are satisfied" (IMO, 2016, p. 13). According to the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (UDI), which is responsible for handling these cases, the additional conditions to previous residing time vary depending on age and the country of origin and exceptions may apply. The requirements also vary considerably depending on when the first residence permit was granted (the longer the applicant has lived in Norway, less requirements he/she must fulfil).

For adult applicants in general (with first residence permit on 1st of September 2013 or later), the requirements are: paying an application fee (NOK 2.100 or ± EUR 230[7]), hold a valid residence permit when applying for the permanent one, have not been convicted of criminal offence, have not been undergo enforced psychiatric treatment of care and prove a level of proficiency in the Norwegian language. Some applicants may also need to pass a test in social studies before being eligible for this type of permit, unless they are exempted of it (which is the case of most skilled workers).

To proceed with the application, a candidate must gather the necessary documents[8], fill in an online form, pay the fee and book an appointment. The documents and the application must be handed in to the appointed office (it depends on the city) in person. According to UDI, by holding a permanent residence permit (or permanent right of residence), one can reside and

---

[7] Price on 13/03/17. Retrieved from <https://www.udi.no/en/word-definitions/fees/#link-3594> and converted via <http://nok.fxexchangerate.com/eur/2100-currency-rates.html> Access on 13/03/17.
[8] List of required documents: https://www.udi.no/en/checklists-container/citizenship-travel-permanent/checklist-permanent-residence/?c=bra. Access on 13/03/17.

work in Norway indefinitely. A permanent resident will also be given extra protection against expulsion (UDI, 2017, 13.03).

2.3. NATURALIZATION

According to the Government of Norway,

> Nationality (citizenship) provides legal and sociological bonds between the state and the individual. A person's acquisition of citizenship provides him/her with equal rights and duties to those who already are citizens, and is a prerequisite for full participation in society. The legal effects of nationality include that any person with Norwegian nationality has an unconditional right to legal residence in Norway. Citizens also have the right to vote in all political elections, as well as the right to hold a position in our three branches of government as, respectively, a member of the Norwegian Storting (Parliament), a cabinet minister or a Supreme Court judge. The requirement of being a citizen also applies to some other positions. Compulsory military service is the most prominent of the legal obligations for Norwegian citizens (IMO, 2016, p. 99).

Norwegian citizenship is regulated by the 2006 *Nationality Act*, which is based in the principle of *ius sanguinis*[9], which means that a child is automatically a Norwegian citizen by birth only if one of the parents is a Norwegian. One can also become a Norwegian by either applying or by being notified[10]. UDI adds that virtually anyone can apply for Norwegian citizenship, under certain conditions. The rules are different depending on the residence permit the applicant has and there are also differences for those who hold/ have held a residence card for family members of EU/EEA nationals and those who have previously been Norwegian citizens (UDI, 2017, 13.03). In general, in order to be eligible to become a Norwegian citizen, one must meet all the conditions of the *Nationality Act*. The list of general requirements is extensive, but it includes that the applicant:

- Provides documentary evidence of his/her identity or otherwise clearly establish it;
- Resides in the realm and intend to remain so;
- Fulfils all the conditions for a permanent resident according to the 2008 *Immigration Act;*
- Renounces his/her current citizenship before acquiring the Norwegian citizenship[11];
- Have lived in Norway for a total of seven years during the last ten years;
- Have completed or documented the language training and social studies course (either

---

[9] In practice, there are three ways of being or becoming a citizen. *Ius sanguinis* is literally law of the blood and is based on being a descendent from a national; *Ius soli* is based on being born in the national territory; and *Ius domicili* is law of residence (Castles & Davidson, 2000, p. 85).
[10] According to the Nationality Act, Nordic citizens can receive this notification. This is a simpler process than the application. The person becomes a Norwegian citizen on the day the notification is received.
[11] Exceptions will be further explored.

in Norwegian or Sami);

After granted, the citizenship can still be withdrawn or reconsidered in case of acquisition of another citizenship, absence of the territory or in case of proven fraud. It is, however, important to note that, "Norwegian citizenship should not be easily obtained, and the conditions for its acquisition shall contribute to ensuring that new citizens are active participants in Norwegian society" (IMO, 2016, p. 99). Besides that, the Storting (Norwegian Parliament) is studying the possibility to make amendments to the *Nationality Act*, as a measure to combat violent extremism and radicalization. They would include, among others, the introduction of rules on citizenship loss when someone's conduct may be interpreted as a threat to the vital interests of the state. Therefore, according to Statistics Norway, the number of naturalizations granted decreased in 2015 after 2014 being the record year (19% decline).

Table 1: Naturalizations by previous citizenship from major countries of origin – 2006 – 2015

Country of origin	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total	11 955	14 877	10 312	11 442	11 903	14 286	12 384	13 223	15 336	12 432
Eritrea	60	88	67	63	248	248	199	323	563	1 114
Afghanistan	194	674	877	857	1 054	1 280	1 013	1 005	1 371	1 088
Iraq	2 141	2 577	1 072	1 267	1 338	945	1 642	1 663	1 418	817
Pakistan	590	544	773	469	430	523	478	424	503	714
Philippines	246	421	233	445	322	410	341	479	851	704
Thailand	263	427	247	483	267	363	265	346	547	683
Somalia	1 281	2 196	1 315	1 737	1 528	2 092	1 571	1 667	1 138	451
Russia	458	436	515	622	673	630	629	418	401	444
India	187	235	141	185	152	209	130	132	213	382
Myanmar	0	5	4	33	103	260	325	533	838	378

Source: Statistics Norway

As can be noted in Table 1, most of the countries of origin are from Africa and Asia regions and the top 10 countries shown above account for 52% of the naturalizations given in 2015. The numbers are considerably low if compared to the total of immigrants living in a long-term basis (+7 years) in Norway (Table 2). The countries of origin also differ, with five European countries in the top 10 list. These 10 countries listed below account for 47% of the immigrants residing in Norway for more than 7 years[12]. The only countries that figure in both lists are Iraq, Somalia and Pakistan, and in the case of the first two, it is possible to note that the growth in the number of long-term residents is accompanied by a decrease in the number of

---

[12] They are likely to be permanent residents, but there are no specific statistics about this group available.

naturalizations.

Table 2: Immigrants, by major countries of origin and years of residence (+7 years) - 2006 -2015

Country of origin	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total	184 565	198 064	211 274	223 548	240 600	255 247	270 244	286 699	306 368	337 020
Poland	4 958	5 091	5 218	5 445	5 857	6 226	7 378	9 893	15 269	25 171
Sweden	14 489	15 378	15 973	16 454	16 985	17 473	17 906	18 475	19 203	20 138
Iraq	4 545	6 463	9 902	10 936	13 355	14 197	14 945	15 651	16 111	16 858
Pakistan	12 086	12 410	12 702	13 249	13 735	14 142	14 522	14 799	15 110	15 496
Denmark	13 880	13 952	14 102	14 202	14 291	14 415	14 469	14 535	14 573	14 715
Somalia	4 746	5 586	6 835	7 624	9 456	10 930	11 816	12 605	13 391	14 694
Germany	6 511	6 894	7 322	7 815	8 401	8 912	9 554	10 384	11 568	13 671
Bosnia-Herzegovina	11 202	11 780	11 744	11 750	11 916	11 962	12 014	12 069	12 077	12 134
Vietnam	10 541	10 692	10 825	11 022	11 231	11 366	11 574	11 766	11 929	12 053
Iran	8 087	8 670	9 162	9 906	10 526	11 121	11 542	11 613	11 729	12 008

Source: Statistics Norway

Furthermore, aiming to guarantee the active participation mentioned above and a better integration of new citizens, the Storting established that from 2017 "a test in spoken Norwegian and a test in civics must be passed before citizenship is granted, but with reasonable provisions for exemption" (IMO, 2016, p. 100). This is now a requirement for everyone between 18-67 years old. From a more practical perspective, for an adult to apply for the Norwegian citizenship, he/she should live in Norway on a permanent basis and thus hold a valid residence permit for the whole period the application is being processed, pay an application fee (NOK 4.200 or ± EUR 460[13]), pass the tests, fulfil the *Nationality Act* requirements, gather the necessary documents[14], fill in an online form and book an appointment. The documents and the application must be handed in to the appointed office (it depends on the city) in person.

Since 2006, those who have had citizenship granted can participate on a voluntary ceremony where the ones over 18 years old will make an oath of loyalty to Norway. This is also part of the integration strategy, and according to the government, the objective of such ceremonies is "to ensure a solemn and dignified transition to Norwegian citizenship" and by participating in the ceremony "the new citizen endorses the fundamental values on which the Norwegian society is based, including the principle of equal rights, obligations and opportunities for all

---

[13] Price on 13/03/17. Retrieved from <https://www.udi.no/en/word-definitions/fees/#link-3594> and converted via <http://nok.fxexchangerate.com/eur/4200-currency-rates.html> Access on 13/03/17.
[14] List of required documents: <https://www.udi.no/en/checklists-container/citizenship-travel-permanent/checklist-for-citizenship/?c=som>. Access on 13/03/17.

Norwegians" (IMO, 2016, p. 101; Nationality Act, 2006). The pronounced oath was determined by the King of Norway on 16 of June 2006 and is as follows: *"As a Norwegian national, I pledge loyalty to my country Norway and to Norwegian society, I support democracy and human rights and I will respect the laws of the country."* (Nationality Act, 2006).

2.4. DUAL CITIZENSHIP

The general rule for those who want to become legal Norwegian citizens is to renounce the current citizenship in order to be eligible for the new one. There are, however, exceptions, and some citizens may keep their previous citizenship and thus hold dual citizenship. According to UDI (2017, 14.03), a person can have dual citizenship if:

- He/she cannot be released from previous citizenship (e.g. if the legislation in the country where the person has had previous citizenship does not permit he/ she to be released from it or; if the person has to travel to the country in question to renounce the citizenship, but a civil war or similar circumstances make this dangerous or impossible);
- If the person has a Norwegian parent and other that comes from a country which also grant citizenship according to the parents' nationality;
- If he/she has had a new citizenship granted without having asked for it (e.g. in case of marriage in some countries);

Holding a dual citizenship means that a person can have two passports (one from each country), has the same rights and duties in relation to Norway as any other Norwegian citizen and is entitled to consular aid and help from both countries. Therefore, dual citizens "have rights and obligations in relation to two countries or states" and, although rules vary, most must serve military service in Norway, even though it might happen in the other country as well (UDI, 2017, 14.03).

2.5. NORWEGIAN INTEGRATION POLICY

According to the Norwegian government, integration must be a joint effort among many parties to be successful. In Norway, the integration policy is based on *mainstreaming*, which means that immigrants are eligible to receive the same services and treatment as the general population. In practice, health, education (kindergartens, schools, universities) and any other service that a Norwegian might have access to on a free basis will also be available for the immigrant, providing equal opportunities for all. To make the principle of mainstreaming work, authorities are responsible to adapt their services as to accommodate diversity and thus "all sectors must take responsibility for contributing to the overarching goal of integration policy,

which is to ensure that immigrants and their children contribute to and participate in their communities" (IMO, 2016, p. 53). There are, however, governmental agencies focused on immigrants: The Ministry of Justice and Public Security coordinates the integration policy, the Directorate of Integration and Diversity (*Integrerings- og Mangfoldsdirektoratet, IMDi*) coordinates the implementation of the policy and also immigrants equal access to public services and the Norwegian Agency for Lifelong Learning (VOX) coordinates the teaching of Norwegian language and social studies. Thus, according to the Ministry, "the main goal of the integration policy is for immigrants and their children to be able to make use of their resources and contribute to society. The key to integration in Norwegian society lies in taking part in working life and having a good knowledge of the Norwegian language (Norwegian Ministry of Justice and Public Security, 2017, 14.03)". The Norwegian Ministries report – IMO – provides a broader perspective, where:

> The aim of the integration policy in Norway is to provide incentives and opportunities for participation in the workforce and in community life. The aim is that everyone who is going to live in Norway finds work or undertakes studies, and becomes a tax-payer and contributing citizen. This is important for long-term development, not least in order to maintain a robust and economically sustainable welfare system. In principle, everyone shall provide for themselves and their dependants (IMO, 2016, p. 53).

From this view, it is possible to see a participation perspective, where there is a concern with both the effects on the state and on the individual and his/her family. The integration policy and the opportunity it brings (or not) can thus be an influencing factor for participation – or lack of – in society, although the call for reciprocity is clear, and efforts are expected from the immigrant.

2.5.1. WHITE PAPER ON INTEGRATION POLICY

In May 2016, the Norwegian government launched a "White Paper on Integration Policy", which aims to address the needs raised by the migration situation both in Europe and in Norway in 2015/2016. It argues that the Norwegian integration policy and its measures should be organized around the idea that all immigrants (including refugees and asylum seekers) shall be productive and thus either enter the labor market or start an education with no delay. This would ensure a permanent connection to the labor market. The main justification for this new approach is that "an effective integration policy shall prepare for a society that does not have vast social and economic differences" (IMO, 2016, p. 53), hence acquired skills and qualifications should be used while time spent in adaptation or in the reception centers should be productive because "neither society nor the individual can afford to let many years go by before a newly-arrived

immigrant is qualified to enter the workforce" (ibid).

Besides education and work, the White Paper also includes some measures on everyday life integration, public services, period in reception centers and further settlement in municipalities, participation in the community, where it is stated that: "All people living in Norway shall feel that they are accepted for who they are; they shall feel at home, shall feel safe and shall be treated fairly. Norwegian democracy and laws establish the framework for everyone living in Norway" (Norwegian Ministry of Justice and Public Security, 2016, p. 18).

When it comes to the Norwegian citizenship, this new report reinforces that it "should not be easily obtained, and that the conditions for it shall contribute to ensuring that new Norwegian citizens are active participants in Norwegian society. Therefore, stricter conditions for citizenship will be proposed" (Norwegian Ministry of Justice and Public Security, 2016, p. 19). Thus, besides the already implemented tests in social studies and Norwegian language, the government may add two requirements: increase the period of residence required for an application; and introduce rules for the rescinding of citizenship for the violation of certain provisions in the Penal Code (ibid).

3. METHODOLOGY

The aim of this section is to present the methodologies used to conduct this study. It will focus on explaining which tools were chosen – and how they were used – to address the research questions, and critically point out ethical considerations and the and reliability and validity of the study.

3.1. CHOICE OF RESEARCH METHODS

Both quantitative and qualitative methods are useful, and the choice between them is dependent on what will better address the research questions of a study. For this thesis, which aims to explore feelings and perceptions of naturalized citizens and denizens about their own status, emotions and experiences within the Norwegian society, it was crucial for me to get involved with the participants to then understand them in a genuine (and emotional) way.

In this sense, qualitative research methods were the most suitable, since they are concerned with "social structures or with individual experiences" and resources, rules and constraints are significant (Hay, 2010, p. 5). Moreover, this type of research seeks to emphasize "multiple meanings" instead of imposing one "dominant or correct interpretation" (ibid, p. 8). This approach thus allowed the participants to describe situations or experiences from their perspectives. In qualitative research, social world is viewed as a result, as creation of the participants and their interaction with the research and the researcher (Robson, 2011), where the latter has a "preference for seeing through the eyes of research participants" (Bryman, 2012, p. 412).

Hence, the way qualitative research is carried out allows the researcher to build a relationship with the study subject, always human beings, opening space for marginalized groups and often silenced voiced to be heard (Hay, 2010; Bryman, 2012). These premises enabled this study to be conducted in more depth and gave me the chance to access spoken and unspoken emotions, by interacting with the participants. It demanded me to be open and receptive, which are also characteristics of this type of research (Robson, 2011).

Besides that, qualitative research values words over numbers, is usually small-scale when it comes to number of people or situations researched, has a focus on meanings and acknowledge the importance of contexts. Because of that, the decision to make use of it can be also considered a political choice, where the researcher may find space to state how the world is and/ or should be through the research (Robson, 2011).

3.2. PARTICIPANTS SELECTION

When I decided on my topic, I knew I wanted to conduct interviews with people who would fulfil certain requirements that would allow me to address my study purpose, such as being a naturalized citizen or a denizen. At the same time, I also wanted to get diversity within the sample, and have a balance in terms of gender, countries/ continent of origin, time in Trondheim, Norway and legal status. I so directed effort on getting a balanced sample in these regards. However, since I did not have any (natural) common criteria among all the participants besides they all live in Norway, I decided to restrict my sample to highly skilled people. This decision naturally imposed limitations to my study and I feel I could have gotten more diversity in terms data if I had interview people under other professional circumstances, but at the same time it was useful to have one common point when conducting the interview and doing the analysis. I would, for example, probably need different interview guides to conduct the study, and due to my limited resources (such as time and access) this was not possible.

I then conducted 10 individual in-depth interviews between 27.01.2017 and 28.02.2017, where I used a semi-structured interview guide to collect primary data. All participants are highly educated and highly skilled, and are currently employed. Regarding education, one holds a bachelor degree, three hold a Master's degree and six have Doctoral degrees. Regarding work, two are PhD Candidates, two are Research Scientists, two are Engineers, one is Emeritus Professor, one is Professor, one is Research Advisor and one is Senior Scientist. The sample is thus composed of a relatively resourceful group, so in many ways they constitute a kind of elite in the Norwegian society – they know how the Norwegian system works, they are aware of their rights, they are in a situation from where they can criticize more freely than other groups, and so on. Besides that, five are denizens and five are naturalized citizens, whereas two of the latter are dual citizens. Five are women and five are men. They all live in Trondheim and reasons to come and to stay in Norway were diverse, such as the motivation behind applying (or not) for Norwegian citizenship (more on Table 3). Even though only 6 out of 10 have applied, all of them would fulfil the initial requirements to start the process. In this sense, it is possible to assume that the ones who have not done it have chosen not to do so.

Yet I am conscious that my sample choice is thus representative of a specific group. It exposes the trade-offs of choosing, and I would not say it reaches (even virtually) everybody, as some other studies argue to do. This was not, however, the purpose of this thesis, although I think it is important to acknowledge other takes. The possibilities of this type of study are various, and

I made this choice in order to more narrowly focus my study. I do not think it affects the quality of my analysis either, since I felt the fact they were professionally settled somehow allowed them to bring more of their personalities to the conversation and, consequently, diversity to the answers I got.

When it comes to selecting the participants, I did a purposive sampling, because I knew what I wanted to address with them. According to Robson (2011), the principle on this type of sampling is the judgment of the researcher, and "a sample is built up which enables the researcher to satisfy their specific needs in a project" (p. 275). Additionally, I interviewed one person that I knew, and after I interview this participant, I employed a snowball sampling strategy, which involves the participants indicating new possible participants, involved in similar situations as themselves. I got all the other interviews by indication, either by the participants themselves or other people from my network (supervisor, friends, friends of friends). I did not used criterion or convenience sampling because, for the former, although I had specific criteria in mind, I did not select all cases that meet them, and in the case of the latter, I did choose among the indications and did not interview all of them or the firsts I got (Hay, 2010; Robson, 2011). In total, I had 21 indications and 10 participants. Regarding the size of the sample, more important than how many interviews are done, is how they are conducted and the quality of the informants (Robson, 2011; Bryman, 2012). Following Hay's (2010) insight, I find possible to assume that I conducted enough interviews, because I had the 'right' people. They were right because they provided me significant material to understand and address my research question and sub-questions.

Moreover, when I got an indication, the participant I have already interviewed put me in contact with the new one, in case he/she would find better to check their availability or interest first. In other cases, they would just give me contact details of the person. In all cases, I sent an e-mail briefly explaining the research purpose and asking about their availability, both in terms of date and place. They have all chosen the meeting venues themselves, and except for one, I went to their working places. I found important to let them choose when and where we were meeting because I think it could influence on how comfortable they would feel during the interview, and hence willing to share personal experiences and feelings.

Along the interviews, I noticed that the background information of the participants was essential to comprehend their answers, such as their individual contexts and thus decided to make it available in a more visual way. More detailed information about the participants can be found

in Table 3, presented below. As can be noted, Europeans remained as denizens, and thus may have had seen no need to change legal status, whereas those from other regions probably saw more benefits.

Table 3: Background information overview – research participants

	Continent of origin[15]	Gender	Year of birth	Legal Status	Time in Norway	Reason to come	Reason to stay	Reason to apply/ not apply*
1	Africa	Male	1983	Denizen[16]	7 years	Due to the political situation in the home country (as a refugee)	Same as to come	Safety and protection
2	Asia	Female	1971	Citizen	27 years	Family reunion	Work and family	Practicalities (travel, access)
3	Europe	Male	1944	Denizen	44 years	Work and family reunion	Work and family	'No need' due to EU citizenship; does not want to give up on birth citizenship
4	Europe	Male	1978	Denizen	17 years	Had a Norwegian girlfriend	Children	'No need' due to EU citizenship; don't see any point on changing
5	Europe	Female	1960	Denizen	29 years	Work and lifestyle	Work, family and lifestyle	'No need' due to EU citizenship
6	Asia	Male	1964	Denizen	13 years	Work and family	Work and family	Wants to own properties in his country of origin and can only do it as a citizen
7	Asia	Female	1969	Citizen	27 years	Family reunion	Lifestyle and opportunities	Life is easier with citizenship
8	Africa	Male	1980	Citizen	17 years	To have a better life, asked for humanitarian help	Same as to come	Safety and protection
9	America	Female	1983	Dual citizen	10 years	Work	Work, family and lifestyle	Safety
10	America	Male	1978	Dual citizen	9 years	Work	Work and lifestyle	Safety to stay in Norway

---

[15] I decided not to expose country due to confidentiality, but I found relevant to contextualize the participants in terms of place of origin.
[16] In the process to obtain citizenship.

3.3. DATA COLLECTION

Data can be obtained from many sources, and for this study it was taken in form of text (conversations, interviews, readings) and context (usually sensory data or contextual impressions that can influence the researcher sentiments, feelings or emotions). Both primary (collected and analysed myself) and secondary (originated from others) data I used take these formats (Mikkelsen, 2005), and they were constructed and made sense together along the entire period of the study.

In terms of primary data, the first thing I did when I started to think about my thesis was to start a research journal (or diary), where I have notes about everything I did – on how I decided on my study topic to general thoughts and ideas. I decided not to limit it to my data collection stage since it could help in my reflexivity (Hay, 2010) and on being loyal to the contexts on which readings were done, data were collected and so on (Robson, 2011), since context is key for this study. I have divided it in categories that I found relevant and carried it with me everywhere, and I was constantly taking notes about my insights, reflections or readings.

Besides that, as I mentioned I conducted in depth semi-structured interviews. This was the main data collection tool. Doing a type of in depth interviewing process is recommended for researchers to understand the perspectives of the participants within complex cultural situations and, although they are time consuming, they tend to provide deep and detailed data to work with about the researched issues (Hay, 2010). To conduct this type of interview, the researcher develops an interview guide that serves more as a checklist of topics to be covered, but both the working and order employed may vary based on the flow of each interview, and follow up unplanned questions may be added to better the comprehension of what the interviewee said (Robson, 2011). This was exactly what I did and, after the first two interviews, I adjusted one question (instead of asking age, I asked year of birth) of the guide (APPENDIX A).

The interviews I conducted were done face-to-face and took between 45 and 90 minutes each (excluding introductory comments, introduction of the researcher, explanation of the topic, questions and closing comments) and they were all fully recorded under consent (APPENDIX B) and stored in Dropbox[17]. During some interviews, I also took notes, but in general I tried to do it after I left, so then while there I could fully focus on what the participant was saying and making follow up questions was more natural. I made mostly use of open questions and when

---

[17] Dropbox is a personal cloud storage service, often used as a backup tool. < https://www.dropbox.com/>

I felt the participants had more to give, I used what Mikkelsen (2005) calls 'probes' or 'prompts' – questions like 'anything else?', a moment of silence, sounds like 'mmhmm' or I often repeated back what the participant has just said. In general, I followed the suggestions given by Robson (2011): listen more than you speak; put questions in a straightforward, clear and non-threatening way[18]; eliminate cues which lead interviewees to respond in a particular way; enjoy it (or at least look as though you do) (p. 282).

Regarding language, although all participants speak English, two of the interviews were conducted in Portuguese. This was done as to ensure that all the questions (and answers) were understood in the best possible way both by the participants and by myself.

3.4. ANALYSIS AND WRITING

3.4.1. TRANSCRIBING

After I finished conducting the interviews, I fully transcribed[19] them all. I tried to do it as soon as I was done with each one of them, considering how time consuming the process can be. According to Byrman (2012), it usually takes six times the length of an interview for it to be transcribed. I even though decided to do it word by word, both to familiarize myself with the data and to capture not only *what* participants said but *how* they said. This was especially important to me because, since I am researching the experiences, feelings and perceptions of people, being accurate to what they said is essential to the trustworthiness of the study and the analysis.

Yet I found the transcribing stage one of the most challenging ones, because, even though all interviews were conducted either in English or Portuguese (my native language), each one had a certain adjustment curve because of the different accents. Except for two, they all came from different countries, and sometimes it was difficult for me to understand what they were saying. Thus, even though it may sound obvious, each transcription was a completely new process, and I did not feel it was getting easier or faster after I did some. Still, it was an essential stage, because "these notes and transcriptions are the data that is constructed. The dialogue itself is not data until it gets put to paper" (Crang and Cook, 2007, p. 82).

---

[18] Since I was dealing with people's emotions and feelings, I found this especially important.
[19] Recording and transcriptions were done using a software called 'AudioNote'.

3.4.2. CODING

The coding process started just after I finished transcribing. The first thing I did was to read all the data I have collected over and over, so I could get familiarized with the data that was then presented in a different format. As argued by Mikkelsen (2005), in a research process "data is being constructed, typically in three steps: first, when information is selected; second, when data is categorized, re-categorized, summarized, etc.; and third, when data is subjected to systematic investigation and analysis" (p. 160). The result of the analysis is also a type of data, but different from the 'raw' data – it takes a condensed and processed form.

Through coding, a researcher wants the data to have a meaning, where it is broken down into parts that are given names in order to make sense (Byrman, 2012). By coding the collected data, I was then categorizing, re-categorizing and summarizing it. I had over 180 pages of transcription and, although time consuming, I found essential to dispend plenty of time and employ different 'techniques' do deal with the data I had collected. I more or less followed the suggestions of Crang and Cook (2007), and started by writing down my insights and notes that could help me to understand what I was doing. After I started generating the codes, I wrote down what I meant by them and tried to add comments in the parts coded, so I could remember why I found it important and the connections (if any) with other codes and/ or theory. In general, my attempt was to make sure I could remember why I did what I did in the first place.

As I used an inductive approach to deal with the data and further analysis, being able to access these initial thoughts after I have coded was very useful. As Mikkelsen (2005) exposes, the inductive approach can be understood as the one which brings bottom-up perspectives into the empirical analysis, because "it begins with concrete empirical details and then works towards abstract ideas or general principles" (p. 168). Hence the point of view that is most valued in this approach is the one of the research subjects. Moreover, to do my coding, I used a program called MAXQDA12[20], which is a qualitative data analysis software. Hay (2010) exposes both advantages and concerns of using a software to deal with qualitative data, and while among the first are "managing large quantities of data; convenient coding and retrieving; comprehensive and accurate searches", among the second are "mechanistic data analysis; machine taking over; learning curve" (p. 308). Yet I spent some hours learning how to use it, which can be seen as a disadvantage due to time constraints for writing this thesis, I think using the software made my work easier and more trustworthy, because it allowed me to code, go back, re-code, order and

---

[20] http://www.maxqda.com/

re-order in a faster way. I do not think I would have had such a level of detail as I had if I had done it by hand or using a simpler computer program, such as Microsoft Word or Microsoft Excel. Besides that, being accurate was since the beginning very important to me and the overview the software gave helped me to see when I was interpreting or deviating. As mentioned, some scholars (Hay, 2010; Bryman, 2012) expose a preoccupation with the software taking over the control of the analysis, which could be a weakness. I did not feel this happening, probably because the amount of data I had to deal with was not that large, so I could go through it carefully even after coding. Furthermore, the program allowed me to add comments, notes and to connect quotes with codes, making it easier to remember and establish connections (APPENDIX C).

I did not have codes beforehand, although I had ideas of what I want to get from the coding process. The codes, sub-codes and themes came while the coding was being done. After I felt I had a satisfactory codebook (Hay, 2010), I drew mind-maps[21] that helped me to see the relationship between different codes and sub-codes, patterns and especially breakdowns, so I knew where I had to go back to and re-code, re-organize. The products of this mind-map were matrixes around my research question and its sub-questions (APPENDIX D), containing themes, memos, summaries, quotes, notes from my journal and comments. Since I was working with context and theory while I was dealing with the data, by doing these matrixes I started to see more clear connections (and disconnections) between secondary data and findings.

3.4.3. WRITING

The writing process started while I was collecting the data. When I finished doing the interviews I had more clarity about the structure of the thesis and how I wanted to organize it. The mind-map was very helpful during the writing process, especially because since I started I had in mind that I wanted to expose my findings and write the thesis in a clear and objective way. This is naturally hard for me, and the fact that the data and the research questions touch on people's personal experiences and feelings made it even harder. I many times found challenging the process of choosing the right words to express myself and not judge or misinterpret the answers that the participants gave.

---

[21] To do that, I used a software called Mindjet MindManager. < https://www.mindjet.com/mindmanager/>

3.5. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethics in research can be described in different ways, but it is for sure important to be conscious about it from the very beginning of any study (Robson, 2011). Bryman (2012) suggests two main ethical issues to be concerned about while conducting social research: first, how as a researcher we are treating the subjects and, second, if there are any precautions we should take before establishing the interactions. There should be concerns about potential harm, discomfort, and overall negative emotions that could arise during the process. In this sense, the researcher has responsibilities to the participants and to oneself, and is the one who must guarantee that the process is conducted in a safe way. Having these in mind, and the consciousness that by doing qualitative interviews I was doing interferences and, if it felt somehow wrong, I should stop doing it, I carefully planned my interactions with the participants and on how I was dealing with the provided data. I wanted the interview to be a good process, enjoyed by all those involved, and so I put effort on providing confidentiality, privacy and a safe place for the participants to bring their thoughts. Hence critical reflexivity and self-reflection were important during all stages of the study. I therefore made sure that: my study did not expose my participants and myself to any type of harm; the participants were aware about the study and its purpose, timeline and methods, and thus they understood what they were consenting to; nobody besides my supervisor and myself had access to the data. Every participant of the study signed a consent form, meaning their participation was voluntary and they could withdraw at any time. Thus, even though this was written in the form they signed, I asked for their permission to record our conversation before it started, and all of them agreed. Besides that, this study was reported to the Data Protection Official for Research, NSD (Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS).

3.5.1. CRITICAL REFLEXIVITY

As a dual citizenship holder and as an immigrant in Norway, I see myself as both an insider and an outsider in this study. For these reasons, even though my study topic aroused from personal motivations, I tried to distance myself from it emotionally while assessing my research and findings, in order to avoid being biased. Bias involves the subjectivity of the researcher and his/her preconceptions, which makes almost impossible for a research to be conducted without any bias (Robson, 2011). At the same time, I had to know how to stand in-between my "research subjects, contexts, and demands" (Passos et. al, 2012, p.13), because my insider role could also be useful, especially to understand the 'unspoken' issues the participants were bringing. To do that, I was constantly reflecting about my position(s) within the topic, and the possible

implications of it (ibid). In these moments, my research journal was very helpful and I used it a lot to just write my thoughts and possible interpretations down. It is important, however, to acknowledge that I still might be biased in some ways, especially due to cultural differences, norms and interpretations and thus critically assess my engagement with the study becomes essential (Mikkelsen, 2005; Passos et. al, 2012).

3.6. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE STUDY

From Bryman (2012) it is understood that while reliability is concerned to whether a research is reproducible under the same conditions, validity refers to how accurate and integral the obtained results are. For Mikkelsen (2005), both reliability and validity are sensitive issues in development studies in general because they usually touch "very profound dimensions of personal experiences" (p. 195) and there are quality concerns regarding authenticity, applicability, credibility, consistency, neutrality (ibid). I will briefly explore these concerns.

First of all, keeping a research transparent creates validity (Byrman, 2012) and all the information about the study is available (except by the personal information of the participants and raw data). On the other hand, the results of this study do not represent the whole population, and thus its external validity could be questioned (Byrman, 2012). Still, it was time bound and choices were made (e.g. narrow the sample to highly skilled participants), making it difficult to embrace diversity in many aspects and still have consistency for the analysis. It naturally brought limitations to the study. I also found some similarities among the interviews, e.g. related to their feelings about integration and exclusion and to which extent the feel Norwegian, which could thus be considered a tendency.

This brings light to the consistency and credibility of the study, which were a concern along the research process. Even though I found that my findings made sense according to the framework I used and had access to, there are not many studies about the topic in Norway, and results vary considerably from country to country. Thus, before I submitted the thesis, I presented my findings and preliminary conclusion at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in an internal seminar of the Governing and Experiencing Citizenship in Multicultural Scandinavia (GOVCIT)[22] project. Since other projects were presented, I could see that my results are in

---

[22] More about the GOVCIT project at < https://www.prio.org/Projects/Project/?x=1669>. Access on 28/04/2017.

accordance with the studies of other researchers, which took place in different Norwegian cities, which also brings validity to the present thesis.

Furthermore, I consider this research authentic due to the topic studied, which is still under-researched, especially in Norway. The applicability of the results, nevertheless, would be possible in an academic matter and, although does not directly generate policies, the questionings and reflections raised here could inspire practical implementations. Finally, even though I am in some ways an insider within the research topic which could affect the neutrality of the study, I see that my reality and life stage is very different from the ones the participants I interviewed are experiencing. Still, all along the research process I tried to be attentive to and continually reflect on my role and on the researcher-participant relationship, while I was constantly worried with making the participants comfortable (more on section 3.5.1).

4. THEORY

This section outlines the theory that is relevant for this study, with an emphasis on citizenship theory, its development and connection to the ideas of mobility and migration, rights and subjects, and emotional citizenship. This study is primarily oriented to the individual and personal issues, and therefore this section introduces additional related concepts to the presented theory: integration, identity, belonging, emotions, feelings and sentiments. This is followed by the analytical approach of the study.

4.1. CITIZENSHIP THEORY

Citizenship designates the equality of rights of all citizens within a political community, as well as a corresponding set of institutions guaranteeing these rights. However, formal equality rarely leads to equality in practice" (Castles et. al, 2014, p. 66)

Citizenship can be understood in different ways and it could be argued whether having it as a defined concept is even appropriate. It is thus convenient to start the discussion around citizenship from the most known perspective, where it is described as the relationship between an individual and the polity (either a state or a city) from a legal perspective (Sassen, 2005). It is important to note that this study does not aim to discuss in depth all the historical and contemporary discourses around the citizenship concept. It will use citizenship in its broader perspective with a greater emphasis on the different geographies of the term. For this reason, it will be primarily seen through the lenses of daily life, ordinariness, migration, mobility, globalization and tentatively emotions, even though the latter may be hard to describe in words. Although not the focus, political aspects shall also be considered due to its intersection with citizenship studies.

Hence, since the foundation of the term, Athenian Democracy times and Roman Republic, citizenship meant the belonging to a specific land and brought the sense of membership and was often seen as a synonymous of nationality. This idea leads to a tendency to reduce a citizen to an individual holding a legal status with rights and duties attached, somehow guaranteed by political authorities and the sovereign state (Bauböck, 2006). This view is reductionist, since it does not place individuals at the center of their everyday lives and they are treated passively, where the active actor would be the nation-state, lowering the agency of the individuals. Moreover, even though under international law "the relation between states and *their*[23] citizens is a legal bond that must be respected" (ibid, p. 16), it is crucial to distinguish the different

---

[23] Emphasis added by the author.

systems of government (e.g. democratic, authoritarian) to understand the limitations brought by treating both terms as the same.

Therefore, having the individuals (or subjects), namely the citizens or others, in the core of the exercise of citizenship is essential, once here citizenship is considered an everyday act and thus ordinary (Staeheli et. al, 2012) and not simply membership or nationality. The concern is more with the everyday then abnormal events (Rigg, 2007). In other words, how people live their daily lives, their routines, practices and experiences are as important as constitutions, laws and norms and thus plays a crucial role on constituting acts of citizenship (Isin, 2009), even if it might seem unrelated and sometimes contradictory (e.g. gender equality is law in most countries, but in reality, many of the same societies do not experience it) (Staeheli et. al, 2012).

It is essential to note that even though the idea of citizenship might be universal nowadays, its meaning and the ways it is experienced are not and never were (Kabeer, 2005). As many other discourses in human geography, this has always been one filled with struggles, marginalization and 'othering'. In fact, rather than doubting the notion of citizen, the others were the ones who made it possible. Isin (2009) differentiates the production of the citizen through the lens of othering, instead of exclusion, where everything is perceived in negative terms and there is absence, whereas in the first case there is presence, because for instance "slaves [and other 'others'] were not simply excluded from citizenship but made citizenship possible by their very formulation" (p. 4).

Therefore, it is crucial to acknowledge the existence of "movements between membership and exclusion, and between different dimensions of citizenship, legitimacy and illegitimacy, may be as important as redefinitions of citizenship itself", because "given scarce resources, the possibility of negotiating different dimensions of citizenship may well represent an important enabling condition" (Sassen, 2005, p. 86).

This led Cresswell to call citizenship an 'incomplete project' (2010), rooted in the changing geographies of the concept, where the key figure is the *outsider*, or the one who does not belong to a particular spatial configuration, raising the paradox mentioned in the introductory chapter. Bringing the discussion to the subject level, the outsider (or stranger or alien, according to other authors, such as Bosniak, 2008; Hepworth, 2016) would be simultaneously the citizen, hence "an individual and simultaneously a universal body" (Cresswell, 2010, p. 260). This character would then be the "prosthetic citizen […], whose capacities are intimately linked to his or her

geographies (both material and imaginative)" (ibid). The changing geographies and mobility are thus bringing the citizens to the stage as main agents, while the nation-state is being weakened through processes of globalization and regionalization (Sassen, 2005), raising what could be called the postnational model (Soysal, 1994), yet the state remains relevant (Dicken, 2015) and essential for societies to happen. There are, thus, many actors being called differently, yet simultaneously acting in the citizenship field.

Additionally, migration is a process that often remembers its participants of not only the geographical, but also the emotional, legal and political boundaries of citizenship (Bauböck, 2006; Ho, 2009). In this context, there is a clear distinction of those who are members (and thus officially belong) and those who are outsiders (and officially do not belong and are often marginalized), such as the migrants, who are excluded from legal citizenship, either by choice or not. Some categories (like permanent residents), however, have strong ties with local communities and perform many citizenship acts[24] although not recognized by the state.

Yet the complexity behind "the idea that formal, legal and institutional structures intersect with daily life and […] the state is enmeshed in the spheres of daily life[25]" (Staeheli et. al, 2012, p. 630). It hence constitutes the conceptualization of citizenship as ordinary, which is deeply connected with the formation of identities and the everyday acts that may characterize some migrants as ordinary citizens and thus possessors of rights. It is about individuals, or, altogether, "the focus on everyday is not only because normal living is everyday living, but also because the everyday begins and ends with the personal" (Rigg, 2007, p. 17).

Furthermore, as mentioned in this introduction to citizenship theory, the relationship of the term with rights, it's different actors and migration and mobility are of particular importance for this study and will be further explored.

4.1.1. CITIZENSHIP AND MIGRATION

Acquiring a citizenship is not something people often think about, unless they are international migrants who wish to settle in a country where they do not have birthright (Joppke, 2010; Staeheli et. al, 2012) or the policy makers of the immigration countries who have to determine

---

[24]Citizenship acts are here understood as going beyond holding a citizenship legal status, and "focus on those moments when, regardless of status and substance, subjects constitute themselves as citizens and [hence are the] acts that produce citizens and their others" (Isin, 2008, p. 18, 37)

[25] It represents the argument of feminist, anti-racist, queer, postcolonial and other critical theorists (Staeheli et. al, 2012, p. 630).

policies in order to deal with increased diversity (especially ethnical). The central issues that need to be addressed are, according to Castles et. al (2014), three: define who is a citizen, how the newcomers can become citizens and what citizenship means (p. 66).

Before the 1980s, migrants were either seen as guest-workers (and thus temporary) with no citizenship prospect or newcomers with a perspective of naturalization. This granted them access to citizenship enacted in a process of assimilation[26]. Besides that, in principle, an individual was supposed to hold only one citizenship; however, immigrants (and their descendants) have always had strong ties with more than one state, challenging institutions for more accessible and inclusive perceptions about citizenship (Bauböck, 2006; Joppke, 2010; Hepworth, 2016). Different from earlier times, now it is possible to find citizens of two states (also known as dual citizens) or citizens of one state living permanently in another. Also, the rights of these permanent residents were upgraded in many democratic states, and in sometimes even equalized to those of citizens. Usually, non-citizens are only excluded from political rights, which also depends on the type of citizenship practiced by the state. It is interesting to note that most of the practiced models (imperial, ethnic, republican, multicultural) are still based on the premise of citizens belonging to one nation-state only, while the more recent transnational discourse is the only type which argues that single citizenship is outdated (Bauböck, 2006; Castles & Davidson, 2000; Castles et. al, 2014) and different types may emerge, such as cosmopolitan[27] (also known as world or global) citizenship (Linklater, 1998). The main argument of these more conservative discourses (and the basis for critiques) is that a migrant cannot have multiple or divided loyalties and that by doubling one's citizenship the national homogeneity of a country would be undermined. Citizens living abroad would then enjoy rights without having duties or obligations (e.g. political or religious) and would not be truly as active as they *should* be (Bauböck, 2006; Castles et. al, 2014).

Nevertheless, the applicability of these models is never universal or static. Besides that, the existence of different types of migrants within a country should be considered, as the differentiated treatment they do receive. In many cases, the decision to migrate does not come

---

[26] The International Organization for Migration (IOM) defines assimilation as the "adaptation of one ethnic or social group – usually a minority – to another. Assimilation involves the subsuming of language, traditions, values, mores and behaviour or even fundamental vital interests. Although the traditional cultural practices of the group are unlikely to be completely abandoned, on the whole assimilation will lead one group to be socially indistinguishable from other members of the society. Assimilation is the most extreme form of acculturation" Retrieved from < http://www.iom.int/key-migration-terms> on 03.03.2017.
[27] The ideal of cosmopolitan citizenship "is the condition in which all human beings have equal recognition as co-legislators within a global kingdom of ends" (Linklater, 1998, p. 37).

as an option or a lifestyle choice, but rather as a social or economic necessity (Rigg, 2007). It is thus not possible to ignore that being a permanent resident is completely different than being an irregular migrant, in all regards. The latter suffers much more discrimination and those holding a regular status have access to additional rights (Bauböck, 2006; Faist, 2007).

For this study, the focus is on permanent residents, the denizens, and naturalized citizens. Still, gender, ethnical and other background differences and the differential treatment that accompanies them must be taken into account. Thus, acceptance and the relation between similarities and differences influence every area of someone's life, including identity and the way they perceive themselves and are perceived by others. As Ho (2009) exposes, "migrant identities are socially and politically constructed through individual and group formation, shared experiences and the narratives that groups tell about themselves. […] Representations of migrants in discourses among the receiving society—through labels and ascriptions—are integral to migrants' own constructions of identity" (p. 791), especially because "the quality of citizenship as a source of identity is more contested than ever" (Yanasmayan, 2015, p. 785). It is thus clear that migration challenges the way citizenship is seen and performed. It might be interesting, however, to understand to which extent it happens and how the emergence of intermediary statuses such as denizenship hold by denizens may question the need of naturalization in countries that only allow single citizenship. According to Hammar (1990), denizens are "foreign citizens with a legal and permanent resident status" (p. 15). Well, if as a permanent resident one can work, seek for employment, run a business, send children to school, get married, get a surgery, why would he/she renounce on something that he/she was given at birth?

Still, at the same time it is a contested practice, more and more countries seem to be accepting its citizens to hold dual citizenship, at least to some extent (Faist, 2007). The question, however, would be whether being given the right to have two citizenships in legal terms has any influence in other aspect of immigrants lives, such as daily practicalities or emotions, and how it changes the way they perceive themselves and feel about the states they somehow represent. Yanasmayan (2015), for example, argues that states that choose to adopt a dual citizenship policy and tolerate its implications "facilitates for migrants to maintain an emotional bond to the legal citizenship status, thereby not only supporting a thick sense of citizenship but also offering the potential to resonate with multiple allegiances" (p. 786).

Therefore, although the accelerating flows of migration may make it harder to understand these practices through the light of citizenship and, consequently, belonging, identity, rights, it can be argued that the increasing banality of it as a mere status challenges the ordinariness of citizenship in different ways and connects individuals with different geographies. As Ho (2009) exposes,

> Experiences of being away from "home" often accentuate the centrality of belonging in the citizen imagination. Moreover, migration enables individuals to come into contact with other nationalities and cultures, thereby altering perceptions of self and "other." Migration also gives migrants an opportunity to reflect on their citizenly experiences and status through a different lens; for some, this allows them the freedom to speak openly about their thoughts and attitudes toward citizenship (Ho, 2009, p. 789).

Therefore, seeing citizenship trough migration and its complexities allows this study to understand better the meaning that holding (or not) a legal status has for a migrant and how it influences on daily life. By acknowledging the agency of the migrant as an actor, it is possible to go further and investigate the relationship of citizenship and rights.

4.1.2. CITIZENSHIP AND RIGHTS

As noticed, the discussion around citizenship entails a reflection on rights, since both terms are interconnected. For this reason, an actor-oriented perspective also inspired this study, because it is understood that "rights are shaped through actual struggles informed by people's own understandings of what they are just entitled to" (Nyamu-Musembi, 2005, p. 31). Claims that individuals make are based on concrete experiences, needs and priorities.

Being a citizen means, from a legal perspective, the possession of a combination of civil, political and social rights, that may differ from place to place. In an ideal scenario of a democratic state, everybody would belong and be part of an active system, guaranteeing popular sovereignty while the nation-state would guarantee good conviviality, despite differences (cultural, religious), among its citizens (Castles & Davidson, 2000). It should be a reciprocal exchange, once both figures emerged together and with them, the idea of rights, including the right to move and thus mobility (Cresswell, 2010).

The reality, however, has always been different even though views and beliefs on this were always diverse. Classical liberal theory claims for universal rights; thus, all individuals should have full access to rights by virtue, regardless of their status or possible duties. Rights, for these theorists, are civil and political, due to their ability to give freedom for human beings to act. The duty of the state would then be to defend this freedom. Rights on social and economic

fields are considered to be too much intervention of the state. These assumptions were challenged by other discourses and debates, which claimed, for example, that the rights of a group should be prioritized over individuals' (Kabeer, 2005). Another challenge comes from liberal theory, which claims that rights always carry duties or even the republican approach to citizenship, that defended that these rights would come through participating in public life, paying taxes and so on. A different and more recent challenge comes from neo-liberal theorists, who defend that duties precede rights, and the latter must be earned. The rise of this view, however, was accompanied by a counter one, known as 'rights-based' approaches to development. According to Kabeer (2005), "this new discourse of rights in the context of development integrates concerns with sustenance (economic and social rights) and freedom (political and civil rights)" (p. 18) and thus "a rights-based approach adds an element of accountability and culpability; an ethical/ moral dimension" (Nyamu-Musembi, 2005, p. 18). Besides that, when locating actors in the center (inspired by an actor-oriented perspective), it is possible to obtain a better understanding of issues and actual struggles, capturing everyday experiences of citizenship, "as mediated by factors such as gender, ethnicity, caste and kinship structure" (Nyamu-Musembi, 2005, p. 46). This allows a more holistic view of citizenship and rights, and how diversity and multiple identities simultaneously operate as tools for both exclusion and inclusion (Kabeer, 2002). At the same time, it is crucial to be conscious about how, for instance, law and other structures (such as religious or norms) enable or constraint agency and, by consequence, validate and reinforce inequality (Nyamu-Musembi, 2005).

Therefore, the rights-based approach, combined with the debate on T.H. Marshall's model[28], set the ground for a more inclusive vocabulary on citizenship. It considers not only new sites of struggles and new rights, but also the fact that the boundaries (and hierarchies) between different types of rights are less clear, and recognizes that people are actively claiming for them in a different way, or, "the articulation of rights by and to cities, regions and across states, and the emergence of struggles through streets, cities, courts, international non-governmental organizations and regional alliances" (Isin, 2009, p. 368). The claims are being made by agents and for agents, and the ones acting today are different from those who were acting when the citizen figure as a concept was created. This is especially valid in a migration context, since migrants sometimes have to enact different citizenship subjects – and simultaneously. For this

---

[28] T. H. Marshall developed a sociological analysis of citizenship in the 1950s, where he distinguished three types of citizenship rights: civil, political and social. It is frequently criticized for various reasons (e.g. it focuses exclusively on Britain). Yet his work is highly influential and in Scandinavia his analysis complements other social-democratic theories of the welfare state (Castles & Davidson, 2010, p. 104, 105).

thesis, it is important to consider this approach and recognize the agency that individuals have, since looking at hierarchies of rights and rights at an individual level will allow this study to question, among others, citizenship subjects and the roles they play within the Norwegian society.

4.1.3. CITIZENSHIP SUBJECTS: INSIDERS AND OUTSIDERS

As exposed, the most known actors on citizenship are the nation-state and the citizen linked to the first. The state[29] changed its characteristics along time (from Greek Polis, to Roman Empire, medieval Europe represented by Florence and the Republic represented by Paris), while the view on citizenship as membership remained mostly static and unchanged along the twentieth century, based on its three foundations: masculinity, warriorship and property (Isin & Turner, 2002). Nowadays, this idea would mean that "the universal citizen was shown to have represented the attributes of a particular occidental social group: Christian, heterosexual, male, white and adult" (Young 1989, 1990 *in* Isin, 2009, p. 375) where this figure of a liberal western citizen, more specifically male and married, would be the traditional head of any household (Johnson, 2010).

This narrow categorization of insiders leaves space to the emergence of a range of outsiders, that are allocated there either because they lack or because they possess something different (or even do that in an alternative way). As Cresswell (2010) notes, "the citizen evokes the absence of the non-citizen (in order to make the citizen make sense). The mobility of citizen (correct mobility) is constructed in relation to mobilities that are other (alien mobilities)." Thus, the "very emergence of the citizen was twinned with the emergence of other mobile subjects" (p. 263). Hence, all these mobile subjects - strangers, denizens, aliens and outsiders in general - are claiming to citizenship at some level (Sassen; 2005; Isin, 2009; Staeheli et. al, 2012).

Thus, even though not much has changed in a legal dimension, the emergence of the outsiders somehow expose the lack of identification and inclusion between citizens and state and statuses such as quasi-citizenship (Castles et. al, 2014; Hepworth, 2016). Yet as Bäubock (2010) reminds, denizens bring a different level of complexity that cannot be simply labeled as quasi-citizenship, since they are "at the same time foreign nationals of a country of origin" (p. 848). Besides that, the boundaries between the condition of being a citizen and the process of becoming one are blurred, reflecting on this relationship, challenging the feeling and

---

[29] Western.

conceptions of belonging (Ho, 2009). Stimulated by struggles of redistribution and recognition of rights, subjects mobilized themselves towards denationalized forms of citizenship and in-between categories of citizens, exposing the ambiguity of citizenship status (Castles & Davidson, 2000; Bosniak, 2008; Isin, 2009).

This denationalization can be associated with mobility, since, even though all citizens are mobile, there are these geographical imaginations behind place and mobility, fixity and flow and, consequently, the 'good citizen' and what was called the 'vagrants/vagabonds' (Cresswell, 2010). According to the Oxford Dictionary[30], a vagabond is "a person who wanders from place to place without a home or job" or even a "dishonest or unprincipled person". We can go further and borrow Bauman's metaphor, where the vagabond is a postmodern existence without foundations, thus without home and always mobile (Bauman, 1998). The vagabond would then be "all the kinds of mobile subject who move to escape one place or hope for something better in another" (Cresswell & Merriman, 2011, p. 251), hence refugees, asylum seekers, economic migrants. People who also raise a paradox, since at the same time they are mobiles and may escape, they are legally grounded and not free to move.

The 'good citizen' would then be, according to the interest of a state, static (Johnson, 2010; Yanasmayan, 2015). However, this is based on a fixed idea of citizenship, that cannot be applied anymore (if could ever be). Citizenship is fluid, discontinuous in its different aspects – including its subjects – and thus "should always be interpreted with a focus on its fluid and dynamic elements that constitute it and its rights, sites, scales and actors" (Isin, 2009, p. 374; Castles & Davidson, 2000). Citizenship is a pluralized concept, and so should be its boundaries (Sassen, 2005). Here it is interesting to note that when talking about citizenship rights we often talk about groups, which makes sense, considering that they are often given due to group struggles. It is, however, important to remember that citizenship is also a personal struggle, considering rights are usually withdrawn from individuals, instead of groups. Besides that, although the legal part of citizenship does play a big role on how subjects live their lives, it is not all of it. The emotional side, or in other words, the feelings, sentiments and practices also determine the way which an individual will live in a place and/or his/her alienage due to the limitations brought by the lack of the formal and legal documents, for example (Bosniak, 2008; Ho, 2009; Staeheli et. al, 2012). This is strongly perceived in the case of migrants. Hence, the category that possibly puts together the geographical imaginations (place and mobility, fixity

---

[30] https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/vagabond.

and flow), the importance of group and individual and new ideas of citizenship through denationalization is the previously mentioned denizen. That is why, for the purpose of this work, denizen might be the most suitable subject definition. Even though it might be considered by some authors as a path to full citizenship or naturalization and thus an inferior type of legal subject who was allowed to be in a place and receive a bundle of rights while have others denied (Hammar, 1990; Cresswell, 2010), I prefer to understand it in another way. Hence there are at least two types of geographies highlighted within denizenship definition: mobility (the denizen is foreign) and place (the denizen is resident). Although 'denizen' is an old definition (according to Hammar, it is up to the 1840s), its meaning is still very updated and is due further unfoldment (Atikcan, 2006; Cresswell, 2010). Denizenship shows that citizenship lost the exclusivity of being the only subject category carrying rights with it, since the fact of permanently living in a certain place "confers civic and socio-economic rights virtually[31] identical to those of citizens" (Atikcan, 2006, p. 11).

They thus represent a middle point between the 'alien' and the 'citizen', or for those who see the latter as the ideal status, a denizen would be "an imperfect citizen, who pays taxes, works legally, sends children to school, contributes to the life of place but cannot vote" (Cresswell, 2010, p. 264). It can be even seen as a format of the already mentioned quasi-citizenship (Castles et. al, 2014). For Hammar (1990) there are three gates for immigrants when coming to a foreign state: the right to enter the country and stay for a short period, the right to be a permanent resident and thus enjoy the rights that come with that without time restrictions and finally the naturalization process, granting full citizenship (p. 16). A denizen would be someone who have not gone through the last gate (Atikcan, 2006; Cresswell, 2010). An important question would be whether all the denizens want to go through the last gate. Taking into consideration Sassen's (2005) notion of denationalized and Soysal's (1994) idea of postnational citizenship, it is possible to understand that, while citizenship is being performed in new places and spaces (Hepworth, 2016), transformations brought by globalization, immigration and mobility (e.g. digitization) also suggest a reconfiguration of alienage and denizenship. Added to that is the increasing marginalization and exclusion of people from previously public spaces (e.g. gated condominiums, gyms, exclusive social clubs) due to poverty, homophobia or other reasons (Sassen, 2005; Cresswell, 2010). Hence, a considerable share of the population might not feel as belonging and represented (Ho, 2009). While not being represented by the state or

---

[31] It is virtually because in general denizens are given civil but not political rights (with some exceptions for local elections in countries like Norway, Sweden and the Netherlands).

public sphere, people tend to search for other types of affiliations and identifications and "governance is no longer exclusively in the hands of the nation-state and is increasingly fractured" (Cresswell, 2010, p. 266). Nation-state membership often means little, especially when compared to alternative forms of sub-national (regional or local) communities with which state members identify themselves and consequently perform claims and obligations (Kabeer, 2005). They do search for belonging, sometimes at multiple sites simultaneously, and not always on a legal basis. But how is it related to citizenship?

> The question is whether it is possible to stretch the definition of citizenship (so rooted in the nation state and its associated geographical imaginations) to account for these new forms of regulations (and their associated geographical imaginations) or to abandon it in favour of other terms such as 'denizen'. […] Rather than being seen as a legal category that resides between alien and citizen, or, on the other hand, as a denotation of privileged membership, we might think of it in a more affirmative way (Cresswell, 2010, p. 266 - 267).

In this regard, instead of adopting a reactionary position of either/or, citizen/alien, the understanding of denizen allows us to see the possibility of belonging somewhere (else) while also carrying (some) legal force, emphasizing the importance of emotional aspects and ordinariness (Sassen, 2005; Cresswell, 2010; Ho, 2009; Staeheli et. al, 2012). It reinforces the importance of constructions such as 'citizenship from below', built by individuals themselves and in different spheres, as a social construction that derives from their context (Kabber, 2005).

> In some cases, the communities people acknowledge, the claims and obligations they recognize, may be very narrowly defined, restricted to their immediate circle of family, kin, lineage and neighbors. In others, the sense of connectedness transcends immediate or primordial identities and coheres around shared experiences of oppression or in solidarity with those who experience such oppression. This is a 'societal' understanding of the citizen as someone who belongs to different kinds of collective associations and defines their identity from participation in activities associated with these different kinds of membership. Their sense of citizenship lies in the terms on which they participate in this collective life and the forms of agency they are able to exercise. And where they are only able to participate on highly unequal terms, or are denied access altogether, citizenship relates to their attempts to challenge these exclusionary processes and bring about change (Kabber, 2005, p. 21-22).

We shall acknowledge, however, that some denizens might decide to go through the last gate and apply for naturalization. In some cases, this means they will have to renounce on their previous citizenship to be allowed to obtain a new one, and in others, that they will hold dual citizenship (Castles et. al, 2014). This will be further explored in more detail, but for now we should recognize that the obtainment of a legal citizenship does not necessarily mean that the

subject would be fully – both legally and emotionally - recognized as such. The logic of othering might persist and generate what Cresswell (2010) calls a "shadow citizen", who is legally recognized as a citizen but is not treated as one (p. 269) and is not seen as a political subject, due to different reasons, such as race or sexual orientation, cultural stereotyping or maybe simply the fact that he/she did not obtain the citizenship at birth (Hepworth, 2016). Recognizing that such statuses exist and have emotional implications are important for the development of this thesis, such as understanding citizenship from an emotional perspective.

4.1.4. EMOTIONAL CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship is usually much more explored as a legal status, and justice as being the foundation of it in a democratic way. In theory, justice means not only the application of subsidiary principles, such as "fair and equal treatment of all individuals […], decision making and behavior that is governed by the rule of law and impartiality" (Staeheli et. al, 2012, p. 634), but also going beyond law, and extending the concept to social relationships and daily life and, mostly, to everyone (Bauböck, 1994; Kabeer, 2005; Staeheli et. al, 2012). Therefore, people's life (and consequently citizenship) is not limited to law, justice and its consequences. It has been more recently recognized the crucial role of both care (or ethics of care) and emotions on providing equality and, more than that, as an extension tool of legal authorities and justice (Di Gregorio and Merolli, 2016). Emotions are hence crucial on constructing) identity and affective relationships are essential on building citizenship and so emotional representations of citizenship are socially constructed in political and popular thought (Ho, 2009, p. 792; Johnson, 2010). Taking into account that citizenship is an experiential and negotiated social process in everyday life (Nyers, 2007), it is important to consider Ho's (2009) questions: "What are the emotional representations associated with citizenship, and by whom and for what purposes are such discourses constructed? […] What types of emotional subjectivities emerge in response to citizenship governance, and how do they influence political and social behavior?" (p. 789). Although the aim of this study is not to answer such questions, to understand what is behind them and the idea of both emotional representations and subjectivities are important to be considered. According to Ho (2009),

> Emotional representations [are] the lexicon and metaphors that individuals use to describe and give meaning to citizenship, such as "home" and "belonging." Such discourses contain an emotional quality that should be critically analysed to understand its effects. Emotional subjectivities, on the other hand, emphasize the way individuals experience the social world, especially the manner in which they emotionally negotiate the power relations of citizenship governance. These analytical distinctions, however,

are not mutually exclusive. Rather, emotional representations and subjectivities mutually constitute one another, thus producing citizenship as a status, identity, and practice (ibid, p. 789).

In this sense, even though the notion of 'affective citizenship', where concepts as 'affection and loyalty' are central since these are what citizens are encouraged to feel about their nation (Johnson, 2010; Di Gregorio and Merolli, 2016) is important to this study, 'emotional citizenship' entails, by nature, embodied experiences (Thien, 2005) and thus suits better for the present purpose. As Ho (2009) exposes

> The idea of emotional citizenship functions, on one level, as an adjective to describe important features of citizenship alongside the better known political-legal and social-cultural dimensions of citizenship. On another level, emotional citizenship also acts as a tool of critical analysis for relating micro level emotional dynamics to social and political structures (ibid, p. 792).

It thus embraces ordinariness, the individuality and its consequences for broader processes and core concepts of *everyday* citizenship, such as identity formation, the idea of home, the self/ the other and belonging. They are especially important for migrants and their integration. Belonging can be understood as emotional investments and desire for attachments (Ho, 2009) and is central to delineate the relations between insiders and outsiders and, by consequence, establish boundaries on the ability individuals have to belong (Ahmed, 2004). The idea of limits demands an understanding of belonging as "an emotionally constructed category" (Ho, 2009, p. 791) to make it possible to unveil its implications for citizenship and the relations and individuals develops with the nation-state. Moreover, governments also make use of emotions to govern, and one common way is to stimulate neurosis and thus "govern through neurosis" to develop anxieties and fears in the population, including (and perhaps especially) about the 'other' (Isin, 2004, p. 217). This neurosis can be driven directly towards migrants, where their presence is interpreted as a security issue. In this sense, stimulating fear of the migrant - the 'other'- can be seen as a common practice of contemporary emotional forms of governance (Jonhson, 2010, p. 500). On the other hand, being seen as 'the other' may simulate these individuals to embrace an emotion of 'resignation', which can possibly hinder them "from mobilizing to demand citizenship rights" (Ho, 2009, p. 792) and therefore reinforce the given status.

In this regard, emotions can be used to build ideas of 'good' and 'bad' citizen, being at the center of the construction of national identities (Yanasmayan, 2015). From an emotional perspective, to be a good citizen and by consequence be welcomed to a certain society, an

individual is expected to perform loyalty, patriotism and show integration, both at individual and community levels (Fortier, 2005). At the same time, it builds pressure on minorities, where they are expected to change behaviors and their emotional performance (Jonhson, 2010). These groups are often accused of failure to love (or identify with) the nation (Ahmed, 2004), and especially for migrants, this failure helps legitimizing social and legal exclusion through immigration and citizenship policies (Ho, 2009). Nevertheless, even though emotions can be mobilized in a negative way, a positive approach is also possible. Both ways, there is an indication about the importance of adding an emotional perspective to citizenship if there is an aim to make it more inclusive (Lister, 1997) and more ordinary. For that, the understanding of emotions and emotional subjectivities should go beyond the most used terms on emotional geographies, such as love, fear or hate. Many emotions are unspoken and even unrecognizable (Staeheli et. al, 2012), but it does not make them less important and perhaps even more relevant. According to Ho (2009), these type of emotions "are still integral for maintaining or challenging the social contract of citizenship as a foundation of the nation-state" (p. 792). They are essential to attribute meaning to places (Cresswell, 2010) and social relations and thus one's relationship with a certain environment that may be/become 'home'.

Moreover, emotions are also key when it comes to decisions related to citizenship, e.g. naturalization. According to Yanasmayan (2015), when migrants "reach the decision to naturalize after a process of intense inner negotiation, they start dismissing the identity-conferring role of citizenship, as the rules require them to abandon the citizenship that they used to feel strongly about" (p. 786), in case of single citizenship policies, such as Norway. The author calls this a process of 'self-bargaining' (ibid), which questions and challenges both emotional and legal bonds of citizenship.

4.2. CITIZENSHIP AND THE EVERYDAY

To analyze the research question in the next chapters, I shall focus on approaching the empirical data from an ordinary perspective and through the lenses of everyday life. As mentioned in the theory chapter, this thesis places the individuals at the center of their own lives and allow the construction of citizenship from below. In this sense, I find important to introduce related concepts before introducing my analytical approach.

4.2.1. INTEGRATION

Integration as a concept can have different connotations depending on the context it is being used, while policies on integration of immigrants vary considerably. As a sociological concept,

integration is understood as societal unity (Hagelund, 2003) and requires an effort from those being integrated to socialize by learning and adapting to rules, norms, values and expectations of the host society. This process creates (and maintains) social order and stability and is hence associated with the idea of assimilation. To be assimilated, individuals may adapt and adjust to the new country while give up to their old way of living. This process enable legal foreigners to improve their conditions (e.g. of housing, working and living) and realize their rights (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008; Brochmann & Hagelund, 2012). Modern welfare states (such as Norway), for example, have developed integration strategies that entitle "a real incorporation of foreigners into society that goes beyond the mere legal dimension" (Brochmann & Hagelund, 2012, p. 18). At the same time, integration can also be understood as a process where immigrants (and other minorities, both individuals and groups) are accepted as they are by the majority of the population. Integration is then a process who demands co-shared responsibility: besides of the immigrant, the host country, its government, society and institutions also have a role (Migration Policy Institute, 2017, 21.03). In this thesis, integration is defined as a two-way process, where both the immigrant and the receiving society may have active roles on acceptance and adaptation. As proposed by Ager and Strang (2008), integration is formed by rights and citizenship, language and cultural knowledge, safety and stability, social bridges, social bonds, social links, employment, housing, education and health.

4.2.2. IDENTITY

As integration, identity is very dependent on context. In a practical way, it is often used by ordinary actors to make sense of everyday practices, themselves as individuals, their activities and what connects or differs them from others (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000). Nevertheless, even though identity is associated with the particular, it can also be performed or claimed by groups. As Isin and Wood (1999) expose, it is essential to recognize that "identities are not only formed by groups seeking recognition but also by groups that seek domination" (ibid, p. 15) which is connected with the views on integration and assimilation exposed above. Overall, identity is a relational concept and presupposes somehow acceptance and recognition, and is thus located within a social space. It can be one's self, a group, a community or a nation-state, which may constitute a national identity (Miller, 2000). For migrants, the way they are represented and seen in the receiving country is essential for identity formation, since "identities are socially and politically constructed through individual and group formation, shared experiences and the narratives that groups tell about themselves" (Erkhamp, 2006, p. 1676). Identity and citizenship are in many ways connected, yet also disconnected. According to Isin

and Wood (1999), citizenship is more of a status than identity but "while identity does not need to have a legal and juridical basis, it may become the subject of legal dispute and struggle" (p. 19). Yet who you are or how you are seen (by yourself and others) become tools for both claiming and discrimination. Moreover, while some authors defend identity can be claimed, discovered, formed, performed (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000; Erkhamp, 2006) and so on, in this study it is understood that identity, such as citizenship, can also be constructed from below and thus the contributions of the participants on both defining and understanding what composes identity are essential. It is also assumed here that one individual can have multiple identities performed in distinct spheres (Miller, 2000; Yanasmayan, 2015).

4.2.3. BELONGING

As mentioned along this chapter, belonging is key to understand citizenship in this study because the latter goes beyond being attached to a place (or being a member). It is about feeling safe (Ignatief, 2001, *in* Yuval-Davis, 2006), about feeling at home and is thus concerned with emotional attachment (Yuval-Davis, 2006). As identity, in this thesis it is understood that belonging is constructed hence emotionally and socially produced (Ho, 2009). Within a migration context, people could come in contact to diversity in a more accelerated way, which reinforces the importance to acknowledge that they

> […] can 'belong' in many different ways and to many different objects of attachments. These can vary from a particular person to the whole of humanity, in a concrete or abstract way; belonging can be an act of self- identification or identification by others, in a stable, contested or transient way. Even in its most stable 'primordial' forms, however, belonging is always a dynamic process, not a reified fixity, which is only a naturalized construction of a particular hegemonic form of power relations (Yuval-Davis, 2006, p. 199).

Belonging can hence be constructed at three different levels, as suggested by Yuval-Davis (2006): "social locations; individuals' identifications and emotional attachments to various collectivities and groupings (identities); ethical and political values" (p. 199) that can further become requisites of belonging (ibid, p. 209). In this sense, belonging is integral to debates on citizenship related to migration and integration, especially when it comes to marginalized groups (Ho, 2009). It questions their ability to love the nation they are represent as citizens and, consequently, generates the insider and outsider debate (Ahmed, 2004), raising simultaneous citizenship subjects which are discussed in this thesis.

4.2.4. EMOTIONS, FEELINGS AND SENTIMENTS

Emotions, feelings and sentiments are often seen as synonymous in everyday life. It is, however, essential to differentiate them and clarify what is meant by each concept. Emotions exist beyond psychological states and are social and cultural practices and can both come from within and move outwards and come from without and move inward. This idea assumes that a group, a community has emotions and that an individual can get drawn into the group by making the emotions of the group its own (Ahmed, 2004). Hence, emotions are adaptive reactions to life situations (TenHouten, 2007) and are embodied, taking place within and around spatial scales (the body being the first and most obvious) (Davidson and Milligan, 2004). Feelings refer to a state of mind and usually follow emotions and while emotions involve actions and movements often revealed by the body – facial expression, gestures, posture, conversation – in a public sphere, feelings are private, and play out in the mind, even though they can also be shared in a conversation, for example (TenHouten, 2007). Sentiments are, on the other hand, socially (and culturally) constructed. They usually involve another person or a group and may be named as friendship, loyalty, patriotism, romantic love. In this sense, sentiments can be seen as emotions with a long-term duration. When emotions are stable they potentially become sentiments. Thus, sentiments are no mere aggregations of emotions or feelings, but "rather stable, long lasting, and of moderate level of intensity, in which the feeling component of the emotion is not continuously present" (TenHouten, 2007, p. 5-6). Both emotions and sentiments, however, can be expressed as if they were feelings, as in saying "I feel happy/sad", "I feel love for my mother" and so on. Here the first case, where emotions (happiness, fear, anger) and feelings interact, will be more used, although the relationship with some sentiments (patriotism, loyalty) is also important.

4.2.5. ANALYTICAL APPROACH

For this study, having an approach that values ordinariness means that what the participants consider as citizenship is the starting point to address the research questions, since their understanding derive from individual experiences and is a social construction from their particular contexts. Context is more than the nation-state they reside, yet challenges the assumption of membership and consequent allegiance to a single territory and hence this study seeks to understand: *what are the research participant's definitions of citizenship?*

43

Therefore, citizenship is a legal status that can be granted in different ways, either passively (e.g. by birth or notification) or actively (e.g. by application). This is the legal dimension of being a citizen and by holding this status an individual is theoretically officially recognized as part of the state. Nevertheless, this thesis argues on whether by acquiring the Norwegian citizenship a former immigrant becomes part of the Norwegian society in practice or if by not having it a denizen remains an outsider. Hence, *how does citizenship status influence on the participant's feelings about integration and belonging?*

Moreover, a status carries both rights and obligations with it. In Norway, the main practical difference in this regard between denizens and citizens is that the latter are allowed to vote in national elections. Besides that, they all pay taxes and in theory have equal conditions to participate and contribute to the community life. Yet beyond practicalities, the subjective side (e.g. personal ties, emotions) and (usually) unspoken issues (e.g. homophobia, social differences, racism) may lead to discrimination and marginalization of both groups, despite status. In this sense, I argue that by having a systemic view of citizenship and rights we can understand how their consequences operate as tools for inclusion and exclusion, simultaneously. Thus, *how do rights granted by citizenship status influence on the participants' feelings about integration and belonging?*

So, although I acknowledge the role of citizenship as a legal status and the importance of understating its various unfoldment, I recognize the need of escalating the comprehension to a more subjective dimension. For this reason, this study also uses the concept of "emotional citizenship", as a way to access participants' feelings and address relevant concepts for the analysis, especially belonging, integration and identity. I decided to use this perspective because I consider the way someone's daily life takes place goes beyond the lack or existence of legal documents and is very much influenced by emotions and advantages or limitations brought by them. Additionally, the existence of legal and imaginary outsiders needs to be recognized and becomes fundamental when the integration of the participants in Norway. For this reason, the overall concept of othering and more specifically the idea of "shadow citizen" will be used along the further chapters, also named as 'other' and 'outsider'. Through this approach, I intend to address the main research question of this study: *How do three aspects of citizenship - status, rights and emotions - influence on denizens and naturalized citizens' integration in the Norwegian society?*

5. ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I will present and discuss the findings[32] of my data collection. As I mentioned in the methodology, I have done 10 semi-structured interviews with immigrants, from which 5 are now naturalized citizens and 5 denizens with permanent residence status in Norway. It is important to note that, due to time and space limitations, I will not explore *all* the findings I obtained, but rather those I found the most relevant to address my research question and sub-questions. To do that, I have divided this chapter in three sections: the first is concerned with participants' definitions of citizenship; the second addresses how holding or not holding a citizenship status influences on participants' feelings about integration and belonging in Norwegian society and the third section presents how rights granted by a citizenship status influence on participants' feelings about integration and belonging.

5.1. CITIZENSHIP DEFINITIONS ACCORDING TO THE PARTICIPANTS

When I contacted the participants to ask for the interview, I did not give many details about its contents. I just said, by e-mail, that it was supposed to be a "very open, confidential and informal talk about your perceptions and understandings (e.g. what does it mean for you to be a citizen?) regarding citizenship and also Norway as a destination for settlement and possible citizenship acquisition. Summing up, I would like to listen to you and your experiences and opinions regarding these topics". My purpose behind it was to avoid them thinking too much beforehand and then try to capture more authentic opinions and answers, since one of my assumptions was that citizenship is not something we think about in a daily basis (unless we need to). I would say I did not give them a 'briefing' on purpose, and I sent the same message to all the participants. This is important because the first question I asked to all of them, after understanding their background (e.g. reason they came to Norway, motivation; more on APPENDIX A), was: "How do you personally understand citizenship?".

There was not a common answer to this question, however all of them referred to a legal aspect of citizenship, emphasizing that as a citizen one has rights and obligations (or duties), is under state protection and is allowed or denied to vote. They then brought the fundamental axes of citizenship – extent, content and depth, based on the idea that it is a legal "status held under the authority of a state" (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 2).

---

[32] Participants' quotes are referred by number, according to Table 3.

One participant mentioned that although she knows she has the right to vote, she is not so concerned about it because she is not so keen about politics, so for her "citizenship is wider than choosing a party" (2) because it helps her to understand where she belongs. By the context of her answer, it was possible to understand that by belonging she meant being part of a nation-state. In this scenario, it would result in membership and, as a member of a state, an individual is entitled to enjoy a legal status with rights and duties attached (Bauböck, 2006). Thus, under the legal framework, some other participants mentioned territory or state attachment as part of citizenship definition. According to Bauböck (2010), "citizenship as a legal status is a relation between individuals and territorial political entities, among which states are the most important ones" (ibid., p. 848). The participants brought it, however, with different approaches. Two mentioned that where a person comes from is not important, at the same time when asked to define citizenship a person who said that a state is just "a piece of land" mentioned that "citizenship, it just doesn't matter. Why should it matter where you happened to be born?" (5), in a sense attaching citizenship to a place. A citizen was also mentioned as "a subject of a state" (7) and law, norms and rules were cited by most participants at some point, and that "by following the rules you would be given something back" (6). In this sense,

> "If you are a citizen in one country you should be able to do the things without so much influence from the political instances I think. How you act is always dependent on the political situation or your economic status, and sometimes you have to become an active person to achieve things and I don't like that" (8).

At the same time,

> "Citizenship *is not* the obligation to a legal system and a piece of paper that you carry to cross a border because at the end of the day I may be completely outside of the formal economy, I may be completely outside of the legal system and I still might get the right to vote because I am connected to the national infrastructure" (7).

Hence it is possible to note that the participants defined citizenship in other ways than just in a legal sense. Participation and integration were also present on their definitions, connecting the concept to how they live their lives on an everyday basis. Thus, while participation is about having an active role in economic, social and political spheres of a receiving society (Leitner & Ehrkamp, 2006), integration is a multi-layered concept that embraces international and national policies and goals, migrant adaptation process and individual experiences (Erdal, 2013). "Fight for mine and others' rights" (5) and having it as way to contribute, to give back to the society was recurrent, while three also mentioned that acting and behaving well and as a Norwegian would make them be "good citizens" (1, 2, 8).

> "We want to be good citizens and to behave and then one thing is to learn the norms and then see what other people do, and also learn what Norwegians do. Then we see ok, that is the way they accept it. Then I would probably change something they do not like and try to do things more normal" (2).

The five participants who mentioned these concepts in their definitions exemplified it by saying they try to participate in protests, be aware of the law, eat the same food, and do what 'Norwegians' do. This idea of 'Norwegian-ness' or 'Norwegian way' was not a consensus, since while one participant said, "I am very much against these attempts to define Norwegian society or Norwegians in terms of what Norwegians do and those who say that to be a Norwegian you must do this" (3) others used that as a way to measure their participation and as a citizenship definition. Thus, although Norwegian-ness can be referred as a cultural practice (where immigrants shall adapt to Norwegian customs, food traditions and cultural codex) or what Castles et al. (2014) would call assimilation, the Norwegian Language Council employed ethnicity as the key boundary for it, where 'Norwegian' means 'ethnic Norwegian', as a synonymous for whiteness. Citizenship is also highlighted as a criterion for 'Norwegian-ness' (Vassenden, 2010), such as other factors as language, birthplace and appearance in a broader sense can be an indicator (Erdal & Ezzati, 2015b, 30.03).

Therefore, the way one feels and how one identifies him/herself as belonging is key. Belonging as a broader concept was also mentioned by all participants, as well as identity. In this sense, belonging can also be understood as an "emotionally constructed category to understand its implications for citizenship" (Ho, 2009, p. 791), while identity is the way one is seen and recognized by him/herself and the society and is often subject of struggle and dispute (Isin & Wood, 1999). When asked about citizenship, 5 out of 10 participants spontaneously talked about identity as if these were two connected concepts, where the latter would be the broadest. In this sense, citizenship would be a part of identity and does not determine who the person is for 4 of the participants. Two participants exemplified by saying that multiple identities can be found within one citizenship. Nevertheless, while one participant said that "everybody see us as Norwegians and I think we have created an identity of normal people" (8), four of those who naturalized exposed a clear separation between being a Norwegian in a citizenship manner and in an identity sense, and emphasized that "I will never be a real Norwegian" (2, 4, 6, 10). They mentioned that they see themselves as having double identities, by keeping one related to their previous citizenship. Two naturalized citizens also mentioned the assimilation strategy practiced by the Norwegian government and that it is possible for immigrants to be assimilated in citizenship terms or in practical terms for integration, but that one cannot be assimilated when

it comes to identity. By being assimilated, immigrants are incorporated into a society through a one-sided process, where they must give up on everything that differentiates them from the major society – language, cultural and social practices, for example (Castles et. al, 2014). Another recurrent definition was citizenship as a tool and something seen as practical. All participants at some point mentioned that citizenship is a way to either achieve something you desire, move somewhere you want, vote for a certain party, or feel something specific (such as freedom to plan, travel). Eight out of ten participants mentioned that having a *good*[33] citizenship make their life easier and for those who did not have it before were motivated by it when changing to the Norwegian citizenship. Castles (2005) mentions that the idea of having good and bad citizenships was strengthened for two reasons: one, because citizenship is being reshaped by international migration; two, because holding a citizenship moved away from equality and universalism towards an idea of one having a "specific position within an unequal and hierarchical order of nation-states" (p. 689). Thus, he mentions that the higher the nation-state is positioned in the hierarchy, the better are the benefits, the rights and the safety of its citizens. Moreover, three participants also brought up safety. They explained it by being granted security by authorities or even:

> "You never know when a war might come up […] because now with all these foreigners coming, maybe Norway will leave Schengen or might change rules, so you never know what can happen, so what if I have to leave because I am not Norwegian? But I am a citizen, so I am safe" (4).

Furthermore, I noticed that all the participants brought an emotional content when talking about citizenship and its meaning, and that they demonstrated emotion when mentioning their country of origin regardless their current status. As one participant said, "as an immigrant we have one emotional citizenship and one legal citizenship, and we need both" (6). Therefore, when it comes to emotion it was also possible to perceive a duality. As mentioned, it was evident that for all the participants citizenship does go beyond the legal status, although they all acknowledged its existence (and in most cases importance). While some participants (4 out of 10) attributed a positive emotion to citizenship, saying that having it gives the opportunity to realize oneself, others (4 out of 10) mentioned that it is linked to bad emotions and sentiments, such as exclusion and discrimination.

---

[33] According to their explanation, a good citizenship would be one that gives access to many countries without requiring visa or residence/ working permit, for example.

Moreover, 4 out of 10 participants also mentioned global citizenship and cosmopolitanism. According to Dower (2003), global citizenship is something that would be extended to all human beings, who are part of a type of global community. Three of the participants who mention it had travelled and lived in different places and feel they were shaped by diversity, having absorbed characteristics of the different cultures and peoples they had interacted with. The four of them said they pay less attention to the 'passport' and the 'nationality' others have and more to the person they are, or then to their identities. One participant said that global citizenship could be good because "knowing more and better about differences could possibly lead to a more comprehensive and harmonious world" (7). Another said she sees herself as a global citizen because "I have been formed by the way I have been going" (9) while another argued that 'global citizen' became an expression with no content, and that "for me to be considered a citizen of the world, I would need to be actively engaged and concerned with global issues and this is not the case" (6). One also said that understanding global citizenship would also depend on who holds it:

> "This thing of being a global citizen, I think I use it more as a defence mechanism. It makes my life easier because even if you ask me to define what a global citizen is it would be difficult because I can be a global citizen from the social norms in Norway […] people look at global citizenship from different points of view depending on where they are standing and their origins" (10).

One participant also defined citizenship as "pointless" (5), while other said it is "pure bureaucracy" (10). One mentioned it is "related to cultural background" (9) and other defined it as "not just a question of your formal nationality but also community citizenship" (3).

5.2. CITIZENSHIP STATUS INFLUENCE ON PARTICIPANTS' FEELINGS ABOUT INTEGRATION AND BELONGING

Legally, five of the participants are considered Norwegian citizens and five are denizens. This is important because due to this situation half of my sample hold a Norwegian legal citizenship status, while the other half does not. Hence, part of the data may represent either citizens or denizens, since they were asked different questions depending on their legal status (see APPENDIX A). Again, I am emphasising that the starting point of this analysis is that the main difference between these two groups is holding or not a legal citizenship status, since the emotional aspect and thus how the existence or absence of this condition influence on their everyday lives and/or on how they feel will be now presented.

When it comes to the citizens, they all pointed that acquiring the Norwegian citizenship influenced their lives in a positive way. They said the status made their life easier, either in practical ways, increasing their "social mobility" (10), or in emotional and subjective manners, since it makes them feel safer and gives them the guarantee they will not be "kicked out" (4) or at least the government "will take longer to reach naturalized citizens in case they change the rules" (6). It then gives them more freedom to plan the future, to "dream about different possibilities" (10), since they do not have to worry about the present and now hold a "Norwegian passport, which is a very powerful passport" (10). According to Castles (2005), Norway would be in Tier 2 in the hierarchy[34], together with other highly developed countries. Citizens belonging to these states enjoy strong rights and are ruled by the law, and may have weaker (legal protection) and stronger (welfare) rights than those who are part of Tier 1 (United States). Moreover, I noted that when I asked about the changes they perceive in their lives since they have become citizens, they connected citizenship benefits with holding the Norwegian passport, even though they have not mentioned it directly in their definitions. As a negative influence of changing the citizenship, two mentioned the fact they had to renounce on their citizenship at birth, but other two said it was a natural trade off, and there was no emotional aspects involved. The dual citizens (4, 6), however, pointed out that they only applied for the Norwegian citizenship because they knew they could keep both, otherwise they would not have done it because it would be the same as "giving up on my identity" (4) since "it [birth citizenship] is my essence, who I am" (6). As Faist et. al (2008) argue, when a state allows dual citizenship it allows immigrants to be active actors on their integration path, which is never uniform. In this sense, the message sent by the receiving state is that it accepts the symbolic and emotional ties of the immigrant and that they do not need to question their identities and go through emotional difficulties, in case they see these two concepts as interconnected and essential to each other (Faist, 2000).

The aspect they pointed out the most, however, was that their everyday life remained mostly the same as before they were considered Norwegians by law. All of them mentioned that they did not change habits or routine and, particularly, having the legal status did not change how other people perceived them or how they feel about their everyday life themselves. Yet at the

---

[34] Tier 1 is composed by the US; Tier 2 by highly developed countries (e.g. EU member states, Japan, Canada, and Australia); Tier 3 by transitional and newly industrializing countries (e.g. Russia, Brazil and Malaysia); Tier 4 by less-developed countries of the South; and Tier 5 by the "Failed states" (e.g. Somalia), "rogue states," (e.g. North Korea) and peoples without states like the Palestinians and Kurds (Castles, 2005, p. 690).

same time some experienced it in a positive way, others continued to experience it in a negative manner, as for example:

> "On paper or when it comes to the categorization, that one makes me Norwegian, but when it comes to identity then I think its deeper than that, its deeper than just being told that you are a Norwegian citizen, because even when I go to renew my passport I am still being doubted whether I am Norwegian or not" (10).

This experience also exposed an emotional aspect of the citizenship status, shared by both citizens and denizens. In both cases, it is very much connected with integration, belonging and acceptance, both by the Norwegian society and by themselves. Here, while citizens cited that acquiring the citizenship made no difference on their integration in the Norwegian society, denizens said the lack of it also did not influence on theirs. Those who, for example, felt discriminated, continued to do so. Many of them are still asked the question 'where are you really from?' when they say they are from Norway, mostly due to the way they look. Nevertheless, other aspects can play a role, such as speaking Norwegian with a foreign accent (Erdal & Ezzati, 2015b, 30.03). Yet this happens both in Norway and abroad. One participant gave an example about her family:

> "At the passport controls they check us extra because even though we are holding Norwegian passports we do not come from Norway and then they check twice so they talk to each of our kids separately in Norwegian to identify if they are these people or if we are bringing somebody else, I don't know, so they are checking extra… it has become normality for us in the passport control, so we always say, "ok, behave yourselves, talk Norwegian" or something like that" (8).

She said, however, that she is more concerned about her children experiencing these situations, because her stage of dealing with this question is over, since people know she lives, works and is a citizen of Norway. Her children, however, are starting to experience discrimination related to their "externalities" (8) and have difficulties on dealing with it. She said "I told them 'welcome to real world. You are Norwegian inside but you are foreign outside'" (8) and described a situation:

> "I have a son, he is now 20 and he went to military service, but I said 'you have to be careful because for the Norwegians you are an Asian boy which can be understood as militant for those ISIS people, you can be recruited but you are not that kind of people so you have to be careful in all ways' and he asked 'Huh, can this happen?' because kids do not experience any bad things in their lives [...] Last year when we came back from a trip we started boarding and he came last and he was stopped by security person [in the airport] and he was asked 'who are you travelling with' and he just 'Mamaaa' I

said 'he is my son and we are traveling together' so if he would be traveling alone I don't know what would have happened" (8).

Her worry is shared with the others who are parents, and their main point was that since their children have not experienced any bad things before they do not tend to expect it, although they could experience anything due to the stereotypes people in general have about ethnicity, nationality and the relation of these concepts with citizenship. As she said, when "we are going outside Norway we are Asian, nothing but that, so we have to think about that" (8) which is also a reason to "be and behave as a good citizen" (2) and "follow the rules" (6).

Another concern shared among all those who have children who were born in Norway is that they develop an emotional attachment to both countries, since, for example

> "My son will be the opposite of me, because by essence he will be Norwegian by the simple fact he was born here, he is here and has Norwegian citizenship, even though he has foreigner blood. It will be a challenge for me to teach him how to experience his other side, since he will be naturally formed by the environment he is living in" (6).

In this sense, they pointed out that their legal status did not change the way they feel about their country of origin and about Norway, and all of them described experiences of embracing both cultures. Among the citizens, it was clear that the change of citizenship did not result in them forgetting about where they come from, or even disliking it. As one participant described, she feels belonging to both cultures since she decided to "accept the things that I feel comfortable with from both cultures" (2) which she sees as positive because now she acts as an "ambassador in terms of cultural bridge from both cultures" (2). She then introduces the culture from her country of origin to Norwegians and helps newcomers from there to adapt in Norway, thus

> "Every year when they [the university] have new students we have this welcome party where we share our experience to help them to adapt and live their life here so […] probably I have very small influence but then people learn a bit more about my countries otherwise all they get is just from the media […] because as an immigrant clearly we have a different background so some people are very curious about how you lived before and these kind of things, then I want to share my perspective" (2).

Celebrating national holidays, meeting people from the same country of origin to watch an important football match, gathering to discuss politics and development, reuniting with friends to cook traditional food were also mentioned as activities they do related to where they came from, even though they have been in Norway for many years. Besides that, all denizens said that "overall changing citizenship is not worth it since it does not change much" (9) and there

are "no real benefits" (5) of doing it. European citizens[35] emphasized many times that they do not need the Norwegian citizenship to live a proper life in Norway, and all denizens mentioned they live the same way as a Norwegian or a naturalized citizen and that other factors – such as having a job, relationships - may play a bigger role on that than the legal status itself.

Another element that was mentioned as being key is time. As all the participants have been living in Norway for at least seven years (see Table 3) they mentioned time as being essential to their integration in the society. Most (except those who came under humanitarian grounds) said that it was the time they have been living in Norway that stimulated them to learn the language, get involved with their local communities, add Norwegian habits to their routine (such as adopt *matpakke*, eat early dinner, ski and so on) and decide to stay, and not having or not the legal Norwegian citizenship. As Erdal & Ezzati (2015a) expose, look at migration with a temporal lens can be very helpful, since its different dimensions – such as length of stay, age at the time of migration and life-cycle stages – are key to understanding its outcomes, as for example settlement or return intentions (p. 1203-1204).

According to the denizens, if holding a citizenship legal status would bring them bigger advantages, they could consider applying for it. Moreover, they think "Norwegians don't care" (9) if one is a citizen or not, although they mentioned that since they come from countries that have always been "well welcomed" (3) in Norway and "I could be a Norwegian because of the way I look" (5) probably helped on their integration and on not facing discrimination. Nevertheless, the emotional aspect of changing it and then renouncing on their citizenship at birth was mentioned many times by two denizens. One mentioned that perhaps he has "sort of a mental barrier in a way and don't want to give up my birth citizenship" (3), even though he had lived most of his life in Norway. Therefore, the two sentiments that the participants mentioned the most when asked about Norwegian citizenship was pride and discrimination. Some also mentioned they feel lucky to have it, that having a citizenship makes you feel good, while two of the citizens said their acquisition was moved by fear. One participant connected it with following the law, and he said that acquiring a citizenship is a reward for doing things right. In general, all the participants mentioned various times along the interviews that while in Norway they feel both outsiders and Norwegians, with the former being mentioned more times

---

[35] Norway is part of the Schengen area. Norwegian citizens and citizens of the 27 European countries that compose the area have easier access over these countries' borders. Retrieved from <https://www.udi.no/en/word-definitions/schengen--the-schengen-area/>. Access on 20.04.2017.

than the latter, it depends on the situation or with whom they are interacting. Two out of five citizens said it is easier to feel Norwegian while abroad, even though they may be doubted because of the way they look.

Therefore, home also seemed to be a blurred concept for some. Either because of the already mentioned appearance, the constant 'outsider' feeling, the not perfect Norwegian, they all gave a thought when asked about where home is. Still, most of them said "home is here" (8) either because it is where they have their families, their jobs or where they have lived longer. It was possible to note, however, mixed feelings in their expressions and thoughts, as exemplified by one participant:

> "But sometimes here in Norway I do not feel, for some reason, I do not feel part of Norway, I miss my home country, but I go there and I see that I do not adapt more, it's a lot of noise, my friends make too much fun out of everything, there is a lot of violence and things that I am not used to anymore… before it was normal and suddenly it is not anymore (10)."

He complemented by saying how it connects to the feeling of belonging or not somewhere:

> "Discarding a whirl of feelings at the thought of it, it is different, because I saw myself saying when I arrived in Oslo, where I lived before, 'I belong here, it's good that I am at home', but at the same time, for some reason, it seems that I can not materialize it completely, it is something that exists but it seems that it is something that is not complete, so it is difficult to say… I feel there is always a shadow, you know? (10)."

Hence their feelings about holding or not holding a legal citizenship status and how it influences on their everyday seems to be very dependent and influenced by the reason they came to Norway (see Table 3). For some, the legal status was and still is an important tool that guarantee their safety and allows them to accomplish their life goals. For others, it is a matter of making or not making sense; if they have lived here for so long, it does not make sense to not have it, some said, although if they do not need it, it does not make sense to change, others argued, because it is very much connected with identity, which they all agreed have not changed despite legal status.

5.3. RIGHTS GRANTED BY CITIZENSHIP STATUS INFLUENCE ON PARTICIPANTS' FEELINGS ABOUT INTEGRATION AND BELONGING

The relationship of the participants with rights is very much connected with holding a legal status, since the access to a different set of rights is guaranteed by being (or not) considered a legal citizen by the state. As mentioned in the definitions section, all the participants at some

point referred to rights and duties (or obligations) as a citizenship aspect. Voting, for example, was referred in 9 out of 10 interviews, in different ways. One participant pointed voting in all instances as a strong motivation to acquire Norwegian citizenship, since

> "By living in Norway as a resident I have many rights and duties, but if I become a citizen [I will have] the right to be politically active, to be part of any party, for example. The moment I am now, I see myself as having limited rights, my future can be decided by others, by authorities, but if I become a Norwegian I can get the opportunity to decide my future on my own, and my destiny as well because I have never had the opportunity. I could have the voting rights and I can have my voice heard as well" (1).

Voting is an act that seems to be valued more by some than by others. Still, it has a significant consequence for citizenship and rights, because "citizenship functions as a social contract between the government voted into power to run the institutions of the state and the citizens who confer on the government this right to make decisions on behalf of the citizenry" (Ho, 2009, p. 790). Therefore, at the same time some are active voters in Norway, four other participants still vote back in their country of origin, even though they have been living in Norway for a long time. When I asked about how they feel about this situation, one exemplified saying it is "unfair" that she decides for those who are currently living there, at the same time she feels she has the right to do it. She said:

> "If we had the right the vote even without having the citizenship but because we work here we pay tax here I think there would be much more foreigners motivated and engaged in politics because now we don't have this right so we don't engage... I think I would prefer to do it in Norway than to do it back home actually because I don't follow everything that is happening there every day and I don't live there and I don't feel myself all the consequences of what the politicians are doing and decide" (9).

She complemented by saying that it is "a bit artificial" she can vote there. Two citizens said that even though they have the right to vote in Norway they do not feel very engaged to do so. One of them argued that he does not think voting makes much difference, since immigrants or citizens with foreigner background do not have many representatives in politics. He said it is not "fair" (6) the way Norwegian politics works nowadays and added:

> "And I think the only way to really make it fair would be to have a mix in the parliament with immigrants, I think Norway would have to have more immigrants in politics because they really know what it's like to be on the other side because the Norwegians can go there, they can look and talk, try to have the best decision and choose but they have not lived it, so I guess it will never be the same, it will never be the same. So I think if they do not have this mix of immigrants in the sense of occupying, fighting for the problems that they have been through will not be integral, it will not be pure, it will not be emphatic" (6).

Thus, as already pointed out, what differs citizens and denizens in Norway in this regard is that citizens can vote in all instances, while denizens have a local voting right. Yet all the denizens expressed "it would be nice to be allowed to vote nationally" (9), the lack of this right did not seem to be a big issue, since casting a vote at municipality level was expressed to be more important to them. One denizen said that this is what "actually influence my daily life because that is the place where I live so if I can vote for people that make my life better that is ok, and I am sure that at national level it does not matter anyway" (5). Besides that, two mentioned to be politically active in other ways, by participating in school committees, as counsellors in their neighbourhoods and so on.

Other rights that are exclusive to citizens that were mentioned to have had positive influence in the lives of participants were travel facilities[36] and the priorities they get when in transit - shorter line in the airport, do not have to go to the embassy to renew passport, do not have to apply for visas, can move anywhere easily -, state protection by the Norwegian state while abroad and that by being a citizen "you can do whatever other Norwegians do" (8). As the citizens, denizens have the right to work, to reside in Norway and are entitled to receive all the benefits from the social security system, and these are factors who help on keeping all them here (combined with personal reasons). They said they live a "normal life" (9) with the rights they are granted, because "all the social benefits and pension and whatever is the same regardless of your nationality if you pay your taxes then it is included" (5). The welfare state and its embedded benefits was also mentioned many times by the participants. The welfare state aims to, beyond all, unite a nation, and in Norway it is seen as a social integration project and provides "extensive institutionalized social rights, residence-based universal access, generous benefits, far-reaching public involvement and a comparatively high degree of redistribution" (Brochmann and Djuve, 2013, p. 222). The participants thus said that since they are granted many rights by the state they also want to contribute, to give something back to the society they are participating, and it involves a set of obligations and duties to be fulfilled, which implies on being "an active citizen, be moral and a good proactive part of the society" (1). It does not mean, however, that they should be passive. One denizen described a situation he experienced, that exemplifies the pro activism mentioned above, and how laws do play a role in everyday life, although they could still be questioned. Context and cultural background were mentioned as being crucial:

---

[36] I understood that the fact that Norway is part of the Schengen area also had a positive influence in their lives.

"I do want to live by the rules and even if the State makes mistakes I am telling them […] I don't accept people who make their own rules, and they [Norwegians] like to do it here. If the rules are written down as law then everybody should follow them because then there is a consensus […]. Most people don't do that [fight for their rights], but I speak fluent Norwegian and that makes a lot easier to argue; and I am not using irrelevant things to support my claim, my claim is written in the law, and an authority interpretation is completely irrelevant, is not about his interpretation, is the way it is, right? But the thing is, he [the officer] is used to people coming from all over the world where they have respect for people in uniforms, which I don't, and for me he is just a person regardless if he is the mid Norwegian leader, I don't care, but people from maybe, Central Africa, are used to, if they try to say something against the police they get packed in the head, so they wouldn't even dare to go against them and, I do, because I don't fear them and he was absolutely not used to being questioned, it was very obvious, and I won" (5).

At the same time, it seemed that the decision of living in Norway in a long term basis brings emotional costs, such as being away from family, not being able to look after elderly relatives, raising their kids far from their traditions and not contributing for the development of their country of origin. Hence, even though Norway already provides many benefits for immigrants and foreigners in general, Norwegian society could recognize more their contribution, because:

"People leave their home countries with many dreams and they get reformulated when they arrive in their destiny, and they have to put a lot of effort on achieving everything. I think that all this effort, the dedication is directed to Norway, and I think that Norway earns a lot with this. If you make a mix of all the energy, the effort and everything we as immigrants dispend, is directed towards Norway. We also contribute a lot to this country" (6).

They say this lack of recognition hinders their integration and reinforces their exclusion, exposing them to "social pressure" (6, 10). One participant said it goes beyond integration, since it relates to personal and community values, morals, culture, and they differ from country to country. Another one complemented by saying that this pressure starts at a national government level but he feels it every day at work, where "I don't feel connected with people with whom I interact every day, I don't get the jokes because they joke among them, the Norwegians, but not with me, so in a moment you are integrated, but you don't feel it, and it is just about these very basic things that they don't have the sensibility to perceive" (6). One participant said she feels it can be very hard to establish a deep relationship with a Norwegian, because a foreigner does not have the same background and two others say this is the reason why it is so hard to feel like one. One credited the difficulty to feel socially welcomed to the lack of respect and empathy of the Norwegian society, and other to some people's ignorance.

Meanwhile, one citizen mentioned that one's context influences a lot on his/her integration. She gave her example:

> "I don't have many Norwegian friends but I think this is not because I don't consider myself Norwegian, it is more due to my conditions. I will be closer to those who are also newcomers, who are in the same conditions, so maybe if a Norwegian would come to live in Trondheim it would be easier for me to be friends with him or her than with someone that is in this city for longer" (4).

Thus, as for holding the status, rights granted by it seem to have a positive impact on people's lives, even though they said it have not impacted largely on their integration or in the way they feel about the Norwegian society.

6. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

In this concluding discussion, I will address the main research question of this study by putting together findings, analytical, contextual and theoretical frameworks. Recapitulating, the posed questions for this study were:

- How do three aspects of citizenship –status, rights and emotions - influence on denizens and naturalized citizens' integration in the Norwegian society?
    - What are the research participants' definitions of citizenship?
    - How does citizenship status influence on the participants' feelings about integration and belonging?
    - How do rights granted by a citizenship status influence on the participants' feelings about integration and belonging?

The combination of the different resources of the present study shows that the various factors studied along the thesis are intertwined. Hence, even though no consistent answers were found to the research question, the exploration of possibilities raised different questionings and reflections about the context, the theory and the related concepts used along this thesis.

Citizenship, Identity and Belonging

As this thesis showed, there was no single definition on citizenship among the participants. One aspect that indeed called my attention was how clearly and fast the participants dissociated the legal aspect of citizenship, or more specifically, how the status granted by belonging legally to a polity is dissociated from the emotional aspect of citizenship. The emotional perspective they offered, however, provides insights about how they negotiate their places and '*selfs*' in the 'worlds' they inhabit in everyday life – home country, Norway, work, family, community -, and would perhaps bring explanation and meaning to why they did and do what they do, behave in certain ways and so on. As mentioned in the theory, individuals do have agency, and through that, they use the available spaces to perform and claim for their rights, based on the struggles they face. In this sense, emotions and thus emotional geographies proved to be important to citizenship from an ordinary and individual centered perspective because they are about "relationality, intersubjectivity and an always incomplete being" (Thien, 2005, p. 453). In fact, the findings of this study also demonstrated a dissociation between what I call here the rational citizenship and the emotional citizenship, where the first would be the legal status. An individual need both, the participants said, and giving up on a citizenship legally does not

eliminate emotional connections or belonging. Belonging is thus clearly something that is socially and emotionally constructed, as referred in Chapter Four, and can be exercised in the form of one holding multiple ties, even because "the production and reproduction of an emotional subject […] informs our understanding of the relationship between the self and the places of our (en)actions" (Thien, 2005, p. 453). Hence, these ties bring different obligations, depending on how they are performed. As the majority of the participants exemplified, being a resident of a nation-state gives one rights and duties that might be fulfilled, and social norms that might be followed, irrespective if one agrees or not. The interesting fact is that most of them seemed to accept these rules fully, without negotiating, as if it was a way to be accepted and recognized as 'normal', as they said. Nevertheless, other ties (emotional, family, culture, etc.) that connect these people to their countries of origin seemed to be most times just as strong, exposing them to a certain sense of obligation or need - to represent their country of origin, to continue to experience cultural practices, to seek out fellow countrymen, to speak the language and so on, either because they want to or because they are expected to do so. The findings showed that many of them act as 'cultural ambassadors' of both countries because they feel they do represent the two.

Therefore, these practices might help them feel more at home, to keep their 'previous' identity and to develop emotional and rational senses of belonging (Erdal, 2014, 17.04). Still, as mobile subjects, we will never entirely belong to one community, one nation-state or another, but rather collect different pieces along the way and build our own puzzle, formed by things, people, food, places, experiences we identified ourselves the most with. Thus, as noticed in this thesis, citizenship as a practice is deeply connected with *who people are,* even though it could probably be seen as only a part of it. Identity is in this regard a complex and multi-layered concept that is certainly being challenged by increasing mobility and globalization. Citizenship, as part of identity, too, as the way people experience their daily lives. Hence "how everyday lives have become connected across borders, and how this connectivity is seen to be creating either a new rootedness or a new rootlessness. […] dominate ways of seeing and experiencing ourselves and others" (Isin, 2012, p. 10).

Citizenship = Integration? The emotional dimension

As suggested before, seeing citizenship as a mobile, as a lived and as an emotional concept is paradoxical. At the same time it is bounded and can be grounded for some, it should provide freedom; at the same time it is about the everyday, formalities and bureaucracy matter; at the

same time one has to feel to be or to become, a legal status usually has the final say. I may then question to which extent these paradoxes make sense. As identity, citizenship has long been a domain of struggle (Castles & Davidson, 2000; Kabeer, 2005) and I would say the main issues do not come from the lack of legal citizenship status because this thesis shows that even those who *are* part of the Norwegian society do not *feel* so, even though they have access to all the rights and benefits as the so called 'ethnic Norwegians'. That is, if naturalized citizens have the status and denizens do not by option, why are they not feeling part of the Norwegian society, or, in other words, what is hindering their full integration?

This study shows that a person cannot be understood without taking both emotions and rational thought into account. Human beings are driven and motivated by rationalities (e.g. socio economic factors) but also by "non-rational factors, including levels of emotional commitment to norms, values and beliefs" (TenHouten, 2007, p. xi). In this sense, without emotion and without understanding emotions, an individual cannot be fully engaged with the world nor know the meaning and interpret this engagement (ibid; Marcus, 2002). With almost 17% of its population formed by immigrants, Norway needs to consider feelings, emotions and sentiments that people have when structuring integration policies if they are to be successful. As argued by Yanasmayan (2015), it is important to acknowledge the "emotional baggage that comes with the change of legal citizenship status and that the coupling or decoupling of the emotional and legal components of citizenship owes to a great extent to the process of 'self-bargaining' triggered by the naturalisation decision" (p. 796). Therefore, when migrating, people are clearly facing strong emotional challenges that alter the way they perceive the world (Davidson & Milligan, 2004), and the whole process to be admitted into Norway does not seem to make the situation easier. As mentioned in Chapter Two, regulations for immigration are strict and I think it is worth questioning to which extent the assessments one must go through emotionally impacts on how he/she feels throughout the process, which is then repeated for every further application (permanent residence, naturalization, more on Chapter Two).

According to the Norwegian government, the constitution of the country guarantees many rights, including "equality and equal status for all people living in Norway" (Norwegian Ministry of Justice and Public Security, 2016, p. 11) and within a mutual respect framework, it acknowledges that "there are many ways of *being* Norwegian" (ibid). Still, this thesis shows that people seem not to be *feeling* they can be who they are, as the Government says they can, because they are being marginalized by doing so. Furthermore, for someone to legally become

a Norwegian citizen, the person has to 'evidence his/her identity or otherwise clearly establish it' (section 2.2). Well, is it possible to do so, to prove, evidence or establish who you are? As exposed many times along the analysis of this study, identity in seen as something broader than citizenship, as well as multiple. As the theory shows, different from the latter, identity has no legal basis, and there is a sort of freedom, of diversity on it. Besides that, when under constraint, people see things differently; "it affects our sense of time as well as space. Our sense of who and what we are is continually (re)shaped by how we *feel*" (Davidson & Milligan, 2004, p. 524). Yet, what 'being a Norwegian' means is not clear, nor how it is possible to evidence identity. At the same time, based on the findings of this research and on previous studies, we can argue on whether it is possible to *become* a Norwegian.

Becoming a Norwegian or remaining as an outsider?

According to Erdal & Ezzati (2015b, 15.04), there are many responses to this questioning, but I agree with them that four factors are more prominent when discussing a possible 'becoming': citizenship, language, birthplace and appearance. The first three are also part of Ager and Strang's (2008) integration framework and constitute the Norwegian integration policies somehow, as previously exposed in Chapter Two. As the findings showed, the participants of this study were pessimistic about it, and except by one, they all said they will never be Norwegians. The issue I see around this pessimism is that being, becoming "one of them", as many said, is deeply connected with acceptance, which then deals simultaneously with inclusion and exclusion (Erdal & Ezzati, 2015b, 15.04) and the feeling of othering, of being a permanent outsider and being a shadow citizen despite legal recognition that can be dangerous and damaging, as exposed by Cresswell (2010). From one side, it exposes the failure of a society to love diversity and embrace multiculturalism, and from the other, the failure of immigrants to integrate, stick with others and to love a nation by embracing its national ideals (Ahmed, 2004). Beyond that, 'others' reproduce shame when it comes to national ideals, since "they are shaming by proxy: they do not approximate the form of the good citizen" (Ahmed, 2004, p. 108). Associating the idea of a good citizen with the national, and thus behaving as a 'Norwegian' was present on the findings, and may be well aligned with the strategy of the government to practice an integration strategy that aims to more or less assimilate immigrants.

Therefore, as argued by the Government, integration is a process that happens both ways, with immigrants and receiving societies having equal responsibilities on adaptation. Still, one side seems to be stronger than the other one. As explored in Chapter Two, Norway applies the

principle of mainstreaming, providing equal opportunities for all. Nevertheless, immigrants have many filters to pass, many steps to go through and some are out of their control. We could then question whether having an approach on equality is the most adequate, rather than on equity? Even though the Norwegian government sees naturalization as a step of the integration process and as a "prerequisite for full participation in society" (IMO, 2016, p. 99), some immigrants might not *want to* go through it and those who do so have additional filters that contain a heavy emotional aspect: language and appearance. Speaking the Norwegian language is seen as essential for integration both by the government and by the immigrants, but speaking it fluently might be challenging for those learning it later in life, even though in theory they have passed a test that states they speak the language. As for the appearance, those who do not look like an 'ethnic Norwegian' face prejudice. Thus, speaking Norwegian with accent and having "dark skin, black hair and brown eyes" (Erdal & Ezzati, 2015b, 15.04) is a call to be asked *the* question: 'Where are you really from?'.

Yet some argued this questioning does not bother them, it sets a boundary and sends a message, also because when it comes to naturalization and thus renouncing and acquiring a new legal citizenship, the negotiation seems to be much more on emotions than on rights. As seen, one can have a legal citizenship status, but if the citizen does not identify him/ herself as such, is it still a valid concept? This question implies remaining in the shadow, a condition that exceed a legal status because an individual or a group is targeted and treated as foreigner "despite their legal citizenship or affective belonging" (Hepworth, 2016, p. 17; Cresswell, 2010). As seen in theory and in the findings of this study, both belonging and identity presuppose acceptance and recognition to happen and because they are sometimes collectively negotiated, it can result on exclusion. As for those who decide not to go through the "last gate" (Atikcan, 2006) and make the choice of remaining denizens, will they never be considered as full participants by the government, even if they act and perform as such? One aspect that challenges this assumption is time. Many denizens have lived in Norway longer than citizens and may be more active in their communities than those who are *considered* more. Hence, does setting and maintaining the alienage status (Bosniak, 2008) and thus such a precise distinction make sense?

Legal status, rights, emotions and integration

Having a deeper look at the Norwegian integration policies, it is clear how practical they are and how they have remained almost unchanged over time; they focus on providing the best tools for an immigrant to learn the language, get support, have access to public services and

take part into working life. Overall, all the participants of this study could then be considered integrated; they are tax-payers and help on maintaining the welfare system. However, a welfare state should be inclusive and treat every member in the same way. Brochmann & Hagelund (2012) add that the modern welfare state goes further, by developing integration policies which seek a "real incorporation of foreigners into society that goes beyond the mere legal dimension […] [and] often covers a whole range of areas that affect the situation of immigrants in a recipient country, such as the labour market, housing conditions, social care and welfare in general, education and training, language courses, and support for organisational work" (p. 14). Still, they are part of the system, they have access to the rights, they must comply with obligations, but they do not feel as insiders, but rather as outsiders. This challenges inclusiveness, also when it comes to citizenship, as exposed by Hoffmann (2004): "the struggle for an inclusive citizenship will be pursued by those who are victims rather than the beneficiaries of the market and the state" (p. 12).

Yet a possible explanation could reside on the fact that their emotions, feelings and sentiments are not being considered, nor accepted or recognized and thus are the same as inexistent within this context. Besides that, the recent White Paper on Integration Policy (section 2.5.1) exposes how municipalities should be worried about everyday life integration, since these are the measures that influence on people feeling at home. This approach opens space for giving more agency to foreigners as individuals, by placing them at the center of these policies. It might not be fully happening yet since it is a recent policy, but it might help in seeing integration from a more systemic perspective and more connected with its diversity. Or, in other words, for integration to be good and not only enough, Norway has to go further: "it has to foster a positive attitude in the population if the integration project is to succeed. In other words, the political authorities have to gain popular backing for this policy and promote a will to adapt on both sides if real inclusion is to be realised" (Brochmann & Hagelund, 2012, p. 14).

Therefore, denizens and naturalized citizens might also have to go further. As many authors (for example Kabber, 2005; Leitner & Ehrkamp, 2006; Isin, 2009) and the Norwegian government expose, participation is also a key element for full integration in a receiving society. The findings of this study showed, however, that in general the participants do not perform active roles in social and political spheres of the Norwegian societies. Those who do are the ones who have lived in Norway for a longer period, and feel more connected to their local communities than to the country itself, and thus engage locally or regionally. Most of the

participants seem to think that being economically active through working and paying the taxes and also behaving 'accordingly' is enough. In this sense, the fact that the participants saw integration as primarily linked to having a job might indicate a possible misunderstanding about what participation and being active in a society means for all parts, complying with Bauböck (2006) and Castles et. al (2014) hypotheses (section 4.1.1).

In this sense, time seems to be more decisive than legal status for participation and engagement. Hence as seen along this discussion, how an individual is encouraged to feel and perform affection towards the receiving state (section 4.1.4) may influence more in their loyalty than holding one or two legal citizenship documents. The decision process behind renouncing or not a citizenship involves emotional struggles and could be avoided. Perhaps the allowance of dual citizenship would open more space for participation and mostly recognizing diversity within the "Norwegian-ness" and stimulate more people to engage with the society. The General Director of UDI, Frode Forfang, said in 2013 that citizenship laws as they are today are difficult to implement and many dispensations of renounce are allowed, where nearly half of the naturalizations (2013) result in dual citizens. For Forfang, by keeping the single citizenship law Norway goes in the opposite direction than the rest of Europe, and this decision impacts both practical argumentation and feelings (more on Forfang, 2013, 27.04; Erdal & Sagmo, 2014, 27.04). Even though debates around allowing dual citizenship in Norway seem to be advancing, they aren't there yet. Still, when it comes to citizenship, it seems that obtaining legal Norwegian citizenship status will only get harder (section 2.5.1), hence the evolution of other statuses might follow the same pattern.

Moreover, as the theory and the findings of this thesis showed, people clearly develop connections and establish relations with both the country of Norway and the Norwegian people, since sometimes they have lived longer in Norway than in the country from where they hold a citizenship, in the case of the denizens. Some even went to school in Norway, earn their livings in the country and so on. Some speak the language, some are fluent, some have children who have it as their mother tongue. Many own properties in the host country and are active contributors in both societies. Is it then possible to ask these people to choose? Even if one may argue it is a rational choice, it never purely is, since emotions are what enable rationality and is key to citizenship to be enacted in a positive way (Marcus, 2002). Denizens thus "have permanent residence permits, but for various reasons, they have remained foreign citizens, and perhaps also prefer to retain their original citizenship" (Hammar, 1990, p. 13). In Norwegian,

the word for foreigner, *utlending*, where "*ut*" means "from the outside", which already imply a sort of exclusion. Therefore, while the permanent residents remain in this category they will be automatically outsiders, both in practical and emotional ways. Naturalized citizens, too, will always be foreigners. What is then the implication of being "*ut*"? As Hammar (1990) and other authors expose (for example Cresswell, 2010) there is a need to adopt a more positive tone when directing discourses to other legal categories rather than citizens, and mostly, see them as beyond legal definitions.

Furthermore, despite legal statuses, it is evident that foreigners want to be heard, to be active on contributing to integration policies and governmental decisions and to claim and negotiate their rights based on their lived realities. Also, they all have the tools to do that in the present day - thus agency - but most seem to prefer to adopt a passive or neutral posture when it comes to integration and *be integrated* instead of also *integrate themselves*. As the findings of this thesis showed and the theory confirms, having their contribution recognized by the host society is important for the participants, and consequently has a positive influence on their integration. Nowadays, however, they do not feel they are enough recognized by the Norwegian society, which can be felt in the way they are, for example, under-represented in politics. Still, it is common to "attribute emotional agency or capacity to a surprising range of external sources" (Davidson & Milligan, 2004, p. 524), but it is important to acknowledge the interactional character of a process such as integration. The hardest would probably be to find a balance, but complaining and handing the responsibility over to the state will not improve the situation and would not take anyone out of the shadow. As seen, the way integration is defined and practiced by the Norwegian state seem to be sometimes contradictory, which does not mean that integration policies are a failure or do not work at all. There is space for improvement, but it is important to acknowledge that, different from other countries, Norway receives people from all over the world and provides opportunities for immigrants, and in general do it in a positive way – and most importantly, safe, as the participants mentioned many times. While in many other places all the aspects of integration are the responsibility of immigrants (e.g. housing, cultural adaptation, employment), in Norway the state takes an active role by providing the basics for newcomers. This attitude also demonstrates willingness on the part of the authorities and state agencies to obtain constant improvement and, most of all, continue to provide a humanized integration for people facing situations of vulnerability.

In this sense, for me, the biggest challenge – and perhaps the most important step – is to better the communication between all the stakeholders involved and acknowledge emotions, feelings and sentiments. There are clearly many unspoken issues that are not being considered, either because they were never thought too much about (e.g. the role emotions play, how people feel, their sentiments towards the state) or because of the lack of meaningful interactions, that might be hindered by emotions as "suspicion, fear and distrust [that] can stop people from mixing with those who are different from them, leading them only [to] mix with people who are like them and reinforce suspicion, fear and distrust" (Fortier, 2010, p. 17). In this sense, even though "meaningful interactions may sound simple or wishy-washy, [they] can make a real difference to people's everyday lives" (ibid) and make the process of belonging be less precarious, as the findings of this thesis showed it can be.

6.1. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Along this study, I have changed my views many times and I think the reason for this is that the topics here studied touch on sensitive issues. Even though I had my own assumptions before I started, getting in touch with what people think, how they feel and what really makes a difference (or not) in their everyday lives challenged my perspectives in different ways. I am extremely grateful for that. In a sense, I think that, regardless of theories or governmental measures, how people *feel* and what people do with their legal statuses and the rights they get is what really matters because this is what has a more direct impact in their lives. I was surprised, for example, with the lack of identification that participants have with Norway in terms of identity (and how multiple this concept is), and on how complex belonging is for them. The fact that most of them did not demonstrate emotions when talking about renouncing birth citizenship was also something I did not expect. Therefore, what surprised me the most was the fact they did not bring reflections about what do they feel are their responsibilities towards the Norwegian state and the society as a whole – in a sense, they all expect they can get a job, they expect they can work and have access to the social security system, and they will only do communal work, they will only participate in a broader sense if they *have to*, even though they are expected to. Acquired citizenship in Norway and permanent residence seems to be much more about getting rights than complying with societal commitments, which perhaps are so intrinsic to the Norwegian society that these two groups do not even know about what is expected from them. Still, pronouncing the oath of loyalty alone does not seem to be the path to full integration. In this sense, if the Norwegian state argues on maintaining single citizenship mostly *because of* loyalty, we might question how the society in directing efforts on having

loyal naturalized citizens. Therefore, if it were to put together the different aspects – legal, rights and emotions – and the resources of this study, I would venture to say that citizenship can be considered a condition that is constantly emerging and is mostly embodied, yet also emplaced. In this sense, citizenship goes much beyond a legal status; it is about producing and going through struggles over acceptance, belonging, identity, recognition and, ultimately, integration and the emotions, feelings and sentiments it produces.

6.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE STUDY

This work was conducted on certain given preconditions, rising natural constraints. Thus, recognizing the limitations brought by time and funding, and considering that this thesis is supposed to be one semester's work (16 weeks), I would like to briefly assess this research, since I think there are a few factors that could have improved its results. First, the size and the characteristics of the sample may be a threat to the validity of the study, as well as my possible bias as a researcher. Besides that, I could have employed different (and perhaps multiple) methods. Since the present thesis is about the everyday, one possible methodology would have been to conduct what Hay (2010) calls oral history interviews, which would have allowed me to bring life narratives to the ground, helping to understand hidden geographies and unspoken emotions. Still, this type of method requires a connection with the participants and would probably be more time-consuming. Finally, I could also have combined physical objects – such as a Norwegian passport, a naturalization form application, a permit of permanent residence form application and so on – that could potentially represent something for the participants, and consequently raise emotions, show feelings or bring associated sentiments.

6.3. FURTHER RESEARCH

As mentioned above, this thesis raised many questions and deeper research could unfold this topic in several ways. As referred above, it would be interesting to further understand how the first generation of immigrants are participating in the Norwegian society, from a more systemic perspective and thus less economical. At the same time, from the interviews and additional readings it was possible to note that second and third generations participate more and possibly feel and identify themselves as Norwegians, differing from their parents or grandparents. In this regard, one possible take for future studies could be better understanding this relation of participation, active citizenship and feelings among different generations and, if viable, within the same household or family. A third possibility would be broadening the comprehension of how identity, belonging and citizenship interact as concepts, how they are (if they do) enacted and performed in everyday life and how this relationship affects the integration of immigrants

within a receiving society. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, there is a lack of understanding in current studies of how shadow citizens in Norway perceive, enact, live and perform citizenship. One group that could (and I would say should) be studied are jobless citizens, since the theory and this thesis showed – and the Norwegian government states – that integration is primarily connected with having a job.

REFERENCES

Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding integration: A conceptual framework. *Journal of refugee studies, 21*(2), 166-191.

Ahmed, S. (2004). *Cultural politics of emotion*: Edinburgh University Press.

Atikcan, E. O. (2006). *Citizenship or denizenship: the treatment of third country nationals in the European Union*: Citeseer.

Bauböck, R. (2006). *Migration and citizenship: legal status, rights and political participation*: Amsterdam University Press.

Bauböck, R. (2010). Studying citizenship constellations. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies, 36*(5), 847-859.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*: Columbia University Press.

Bosniak, L. (2008). *The citizen and the alien: Dilemmas of contemporary membership*: Princeton University Press.

Brochmann, G. (2008). Immigration, the Welfare State and Working Life-the Case of Norway. *European Review, 16*(4), 529.

Brochmann, G., & Djuve, A. B. (2013). Multiculturalism or assimilation? The Norwegian welfare state approach *Debating multiculturalism in the Nordic welfare states* (pp. 219-245): Springer.

Brochmann, G., & Hagelund, A. (2012). *Immigration policy and the Scandinavian welfare state 1945-2010*: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brochmann, G., & Kjeldstadli, K. (2008). *A history of immigration: the case of Norway 900-2000*: Universitetsforlaget.

Brubaker, R., & Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond "identity". *Theory and society, 29*(1), 1-47.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4 ed.). United States: Oxford University Press.

Castles, S. (2005). Hierarchical citizenship in a world of unequal nation-states. *Political Science and Politics, 38*(04), 689-692.

Castles, S., & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*: Psychology Press.

Castles, S., Haas, H. D., & Miller, M. (2014). *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World* (5th ed.): New York: Guilford Press.

Crang, M., & Cook, I. (2007). *Doing ethnographies*. London: Sage.

Cresswell, T. (2010). Towards a politics of mobility. *Environment and planning D: society and space, 28*(1), 17-31.

Cresswell, T., & Merriman, P. (2011). *Geographies of mobilities: Practices, spaces, subjects*: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Davidson, J., & Milligan, C. (2004). Embodying emotion sensing space: introducing emotional geographies: Taylor & Francis.

Di Gregorio, M., & Merolli, J. L. (2016). Introduction: affective citizenship and the politics of identity, control, resistance. *Citizenship studies, 20*(8), 933-942.

Dower, N. (2003). *An introduction to global citizenship* (Vol. 7): Edinburgh University Press Edinburgh.

Ehrkamp, P. (2006). "We Turks are no Germans": assimilation discourses and the dialectical construction of identities in Germany. *Environment and Planning A, 38*(9), 1673-1692.

Erdal, M. B. (2013). Migrant transnationalism and multi-layered integration: Norwegian-Pakistani migrants' own reflections. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies, 39*(6), 983-999.

Erdal, M. B. (2014). Where is My Home? Retrieved from https://blogs.prio.org/2014/12/where-is-my-home/. Access on 23/04/2017.

Erdal, M. B., & Ezzati, R. (2015a). 'Where are you from' or 'when did you come'? Temporal dimensions in migrants' reflections about settlement and return. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 38*(7), 1202-1217.

Erdal, M. B., & Ezzati, R. T. (2015b). On becoming Norwegian. Retrieved from https://blogs.prio.org/2015/05/on-becoming-norwegian/. Access on 20/04/2017.

Erdal, M. B., & Lewicki, A. (2016). Moving citizens: citizenship practices among Polish migrants in Norway and the United Kingdom. *Social Identities, 22*(1), 112-128.

Erdal, M. B., & Sagmo, T. H. (2014). Norway's Outdated Citizenship Legislation. Retrieved from https://blogs.prio.org/2014/10/norways-outdated-citizenship-legislation/. Access on 28/04/2017.

Faist, T. (2000). Transnationalization in international migration: implications for the study of citizenship and culture. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 23*(2), 189-222.

Faist, T. (2007). *Dual Citizenship in Europe: From Nationhood to Societal Integration*. Aldershot, England: Routledge.

Faist, T., & Gerdes, J. (2008). Dual citizenship in an age of mobility. *Delivering Citizenship: The Transatlantic Council on Migration*.

Forfang, F. (2013). Lov å være både norsk og utenlandsk? Retrieved from https://www.nrk.no/ytring/bade-norsk-og-utenlandsk_-1.11394080. Access on 28/04/2017.

Fortier, A.-M. (2005). Pride politics and multiculturalist citizenship. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 28*(3), 559-578.

Fortier, A.-M. (2010). Proximity by design? Affective citizenship and the management of unease. *Citizenship studies, 14*(1), 17-30.

From reception centre to the labour market – an effective integration policy. (2016). Norwegian Ministry of Justice and Public Security. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/6676aece374348ee805e9fc5f60b6158/en-gb/pdfs/stm201520160030000engpdfs.pdf. Access on 03/03/2017.

The government's integration goals: All who live in Norway should be able to use their resources and contribute to society (2015). Norwegian Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/a15355e81b7a44f38f981337fe9a44f1/eng_i ntegreringendaennyversjon.pdf. Access on 03/03/2017.

Hagelund, A. (2003). *The importance of being decent: political discourse on immigration in Norway 1970-2002*: Unipax Oslo.

Hammar, T. (1990). *Democracy and the nation state: aliens denizens and citizens in a world of international migration*.

Hay, I. (2010). *Qualitative research methods in human geography* (3rd ed.). Ontario: Oxford University Press.

Hepworth, K. (2016). *At the Edges of Citizenship: Security and the Constitution of Non-citizen Subjects*: Routledge.

Ho, E. L.-E. (2009). Constituting citizenship through the emotions: Singaporean transmigrants in London. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 99*(4), 788-804.

Hoffman, J. (2004). *Citizenship beyond the state*: Sage.

Hvinden, B., & Johansson, H. (2007). *Citizenship in Nordic welfare states: Dynamics of choice, duties and participation in a changing Europe*: Routledge.

IBGE | Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics. (2016). Retrieved from http://www.ibge.gov.br/english/. Access on 10/04/2017.

Immigrants and Norwegian-born to immigrant parents. (2017). Retrieved from http://ssb.no/en/befolkning/statistikker/innvbef. Access on 03/03/2017.

Immigration and Immigrants 2015–2016 | IMO Report for Norway. (2016). Norwegian Ministries of Justice and Public Security, of Labour and Social Affairs, of Education and Research and of Children and Equality: IMO. Retrieved from

https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/5a8e49d721ad456ea8bd698ea2d543ef/immigration-and-immigrants-20152016-complete.pdf. Access on 03/03/2017.

International Organization for Migration. Retrieved from http://www.iom.int/. Access on 03/04/2017.

Isin, E. F. (2009). Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity, 29*(1), 367-388.

Isin, E. F. (2012). *Citizens without frontiers*: Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

Isin, E. F., & Nielsen, G. M. (2008). *Acts of citizenship*: Zed Books London.

Isin, E. F., & Turner, B. S. (2002). *Handbook of citizenship studies*: Sage.

Isin, E. F., & Wood, P. K. (1999). *Citizenship and identity* (Vol. 448): Sage.

Johnson, C. (2010). The politics of affective citizenship: from Blair to Obama. *Citizenship studies, 14*(5), 495-509.

Joppke, C. (2010). *Citizenship and immigration* (Vol. 2): Polity.

Kabeer, N. (2002). Citizenship, affiliation and exclusion: perspectives from the South. *IDS bulletin, 33*(2), 1-15.

Kabeer, N. (2005). *Inclusive citizenship: Meanings and expressions* (Vol. 1): Zed Books.

Leitner, H., & Ehrkamp, P. (2006). Transnationalism and migrants' imaginings of citizenship. *Environment and Planning A, 38*(9), 1615-1632.

Linklater, A. (1998). Cosmopolitan citizenship. *Citizenship studies, 2*(1), 23-41.

Lister, R. (1997). Citizenship: Towards a feminist synthesis. *Feminist review, 57*(1), 28-48.

Marcus, G. E. (2002). *Sentimental citizen: Emotion in democratic politics*: Penn State Press.

Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/. Access on 13/03/2017.

Mikkelsen, B. (2005). *Methods for development work and research: a new guide for practitioners*: Sage.

Miller, D. (2000). *Citizenship and national identity*: Cambridge Polity.

Ministry of Justice and Public Security. Integration. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/immigration/integrering/id2343461/. Access on 05/03/2017.

Norway opens doors to dual citizenship. (2017). Retrieved from https://www.thelocal.no/20170313/norway-opens-doors-to-dual-citizenship. Access on 06/03/2017.

The Norwegian Nationality Act. (2006, 03/03/2017). Goverment of Norway. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/immigration/integrering/statsborgerloven/id2343 481. Access on 01/03/2017.

Nyamu-Musembi, C. (2005). Towards an actor-oriented perspective on human rights *Inclusive citizenship: Meanings and expressions* (pp. 31-49).

Nyers, P. (2007). Introduction: Why citizenship studies. *Citizenship studies, 11*(1), 1-4.

Passos, C., Cruzes, D. S., Dybå, T., & Mendonça, M. (2012). *Challenges of applying ethnography to study software practices.* Paper presented at the Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM), 2012 ACM-IEEE International Symposium on.

Rigg, J. (2007). *An everyday geography of the global south*: Routledge.

Robson, C. (2011). *Real world research* (3rd ed.). UK: Wiley.

Sassen, S. (2005). The repositioning of citizenship and alienage: Emergent subjects and spaces for politics∗. *Globalizations, 2*(1), 79-94.

Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*: University of Chicago Press.

Staeheli, L. A., Ehrkamp, P., Leitner, H., & Nagel, C. R. (2012). Dreaming the ordinary: Daily life and the complex geographies of citizenship. *Progress in Human Geography, 36*(5), 628-644.

Statistics Norway. (2006 - 2015a). Immigrants, by major countries of origin and years of residence. https://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/statistikker/flytting. Access on 12/03/2017.

Statistics Norway. (2006 - 2015b). Naturalizations. http://ssb.no/en/befolkning/statistikker/statsborger/aar/2016-05-11?fane=tabell - content. Access on 12/03/2017.

Statistics Norway. (Multiple). https://www.ssb.no/en/. Access on 03/2017.

TenHouten, W. D. (2007). *A general theory of emotions and social life*: Routledge.

The Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (UDI). Dual citizenship. Retrieved from https://www.udi.no/en/word-definitions/dual-citizenship/. Access on 28/02/2017.

Thien, D. (2005). After or beyond feeling? A consideration of affect and emotion in geography. *Area, 37*(4), 450-454.

Torpey, J. (2000). *The invention of the passport: surveillance, citizenship and the state*: Cambridge University Press.

UNDP. (2010). *Mobility and Migration: A Guidance Note for Human Development Report Teams*. Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/nhdr_migration_gn.pdf. Access on 03/02/2017.

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved from http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf. Access on 13/02/2017.

United Nations. (2016). *International Migration Report 2015: Highlights*. Retrieved from New York: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationr eport/docs/MigrationReport2015_Highlights.pdf. Access on 03/02/2017.

Vassenden, A. (2010). Untangling the different components of Norwegianness. *Nations and nationalism, 16*(4), 734-752.

Yanasmayan, Z. (2015). Citizenship on paper or at heart? a closer look into the dual citizenship debate in Europe. *Citizenship studies, 19*(6-7), 785-801.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of prejudice, 40*(3), 197-214.

APPENDIX A: Interview Guide

Interview guide – Citizenship and Norway as a settlement country

1. Introduction
   a. Brief introduction of the researcher social connection)
   b. Brief introduction to the research/ Master's Thesis topic
   c. Clarification of research conditions: confidentiality, no judgement, interview guide/ structure (open questions, opinions of any kind appreciated, no limit of talking), recording, consent of participation

2. Personal information
   a. Year of birth
   b. Level of education and area of study
   c. Country of origin

3. Background
   a. Why did you come to Norway?
   b. Which were your reasons/motivations for coming here?
   c. What did you know about Norway before you came?

4. Journey
   a. How did you come? Talk a bit about the journey.
   b. Was Norway your destination since the beginning?

5. Citizenship
   a. How do you understand citizenship?
   b. What does it mean to be a citizen?
   c. Of which country/countries do you currently hold citizenship?

6. Outcome(s)
   a. For those in the process to get Norwegian citizenship:
      i. Why have you decided to acquire Norwegian citizenship?
      ii. What do you see as being the benefits and the odds of this decision? (if relevant, ask to tell about the process itself)
      iii. Would you tell me a bit about the process itself – application, is it easy, hard?
   b. For those that obtained the citizenship:
      i. Why have you decided to acquire Norwegian citizenship?

        ii.   Since when do you have it?

       iii.   What have changed in your life since then? Both in negative and positive ways.

  c.   For those who have not applied:

        i.   Why haven't you applied for Norwegian citizenship? Why have you decided to keep the one you have?

       ii.   Do you plan to stay in Norway? Perhaps apply in the future?

       iii.   What do you think would change if you had the Norwegian citizenship?

  d.   For all: since you have taken this decision, have your perception about being a Norwegian? citizen changed?

  e.   What is the relation you have with the country where you were born?

  f.   How do you communicate with people at home? With whom?

  g.   How do you feel about your country of birth? And about Norway? Where do you feel you belong?

  h.   Does this feeling somehow affect who you are (your identity)?

7. Conclusion

  a.   Thank for the participation

  b.   Open for comments, feedbacks and suggestions

  c.   Any people/groups you think I should talk to?

Invitation to participate in the research project – Citizenship and Norway as a settlement country

Background and purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore different understandings of citizenship and Norway as a settlement country. Why is the Norwegian citizenship so attractive to different types of migrants? Why initially temporary migrants decide to settle in Norway? What drives people to give up on the national citizenship they were born with in order to become a Norwegian citizen according to the state?

Having as key-words 'mobility, citizenship, identity, belonging, loyalty', the project aims to look at Norway as a receiving state, and more specifically as a place of settlement, by analyzing individual stories of migrants that are now considered Norwegians by the state and also those who are permanent migrants and have decided not to apply for a formal citizenship.

The study is carried as part of a master's thesis at the Institute of Geography at NTNU.

I would like to invite you to participate in my study, as I wish to interview people who have migrated to Norway and have either applied for the citizenship or are residing in the country for a long time (+10 years) but have decided not to do it.

What will you have to do if you agree to take part?

The study consists of an interview, which will take about 1 hour. The questions will be about your migration background, your life in Norway and understanding of concepts as identity and citizenship. There will be a sound recording done during the interview, and notes might be taken.

What will happen to information about you?

All your personal information will be treated confidentially. Only I as the researcher will have access to the personal information. Names and contact information will be stored separately from recordings from the interview and observation. Thus, as a participant, you will not be recognizable in the publication. All information will be anonymous.

The project will be completed 10.05.2017. After this, all sound recordings will be deleted, and all notes will be destroyed.

Voluntary participation

Participation in this study is voluntary, and you can at any moment withdraw your consent without giving a reason. If you withdraw, all information about you will be deleted.

If you want clarifications or have any questions about the study, contact Caroline Tissot at _____ . Supervisor in this study is Ragnhild Lund - _____

The study is reported to the Data Protection Official for Research, NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS.

Consent to participation in the study

I have received information about the study, and am willing to participate

Name of the project participant:

(Signed by project participant, date)

d

APPENDIX C: MAXQDA12 - Overview and example of usage

/Users/carolinetissot/Google Drive/thesis.mx12 - MAXQDA 12 (Release 12.3.1)

Document Browser: Code: Citizenship\Legal citizenship

38 coded segments from 10 documents and 0 document groups

Coded segments

i dont think i will ever be norwegian but on paper or when it comes to the categorization, that one makes me norwegian, but when it comes to identity then i think its deeper than that, its deeper than just being told that you are a norwegian citizen because even when you go to renew your passport you are still being doubted whether you are norwegian so i dont think that it really determines

Comment	D...	Document ...	Code	Begin
definition; legal; rights and duties; context!!!			Citizenship\Leg...	20
active citizenship			Citizenship\Leg...	28
citizenship is pointless; does not determine who the person is; person is not attached to land			Citizenship\Leg...	65
status is a casuality, you don't ask for it (maybe you do?)			Citizenship\Leg...	102
citizenship as a tool			Citizenship\Leg...	19
it does not determine who the person is			Citizenship\Leg...	35
legal; access; practicalities			Citizenship\Leg...	10
legal			Citizenship\Leg...	43
legal			Citizenship\Leg...	64
legal; emotional;			Citizenship\Leg...	40
passive?			Citizenship\Leg...	34
legal, but legal can mean different things for people			Citizenship\Leg...	61
legal; norms, rights, duties, passport as most explicit			Citizenship\Leg...	43
legal; practicalities;			Citizenship\Leg...	26
legal; rights and duties; more connected with belonging!			Citizenship\Leg...	18
legal; discrimination even with status			Citizenship\Leg...	35
legal; norwegian way			Citizenship\Leg...	32

YELLOW

Doc...

Documents 813
...Advantag 56
...Norwegian 64
Feelings 74
...Norwegianess 79
...Reason to com 101
...Emotional citizenship 114
82
86
63
9.4

Sets 0

Cod...

Code System 813
BLUE 13
MAGENTA 2
GREEN 8
YELLOW 37
Identity 41
Integration 124
Citizenship 269
Feelings 208
Background 111
0

Citizenship
...Norwegianess
...Emotional citizen
...Legal citizenship

Feelings
...Outsider
...Legal citizenshi
Identity

...Struggle

Sets

e

APPENDIX D: Mind-maps

Denizens and Naturalised Citizens' feelings about citizenship in Norway

1 Definitions of citizenship

Legal
- Practical
  - Made life easier
  - Tool
- Safety
  - State Protection
- Decide on your future
- Attached to a territory
- Voting
- Rights and duties
  - A way to pay pack

Emotional
- Reward for doing things right
- Makes you feel good
- It goes beyond the status
- Discrimination
- Gives the opportunity to realize yourself

Identity
- It does not determine who the person is
- Belonging
- vs citizenship

Global citizen
- Community citizenship
- Cosmopolitanism
  - "Escape"
  - Cultural

Integration
- Assimilation
- "Good Citizen"
- Norwegian-ness

2 Legal status vs feelings

3 Rights vs feelings

4 Legal status, rights and emotions influence on integration

f

Legal status, rights and emotions influence on integration

Denizens and Naturalised Citizens' feelings about citizenship in Norway

1 — Definitions of citizenship

2 — Legal status vs feelings

Citizens

- How having it influenced +
  - Made life easier — Social mobility (Passport)
  - Don't have to worry much about future, freedom
  - Feel safer, that they won't be 'kicked out'
- Acquiring/ changing did not influence
  - it did not change others' perception towards them — bad only for some, for others is just a trade off
- Having it influenced - ?
  - Give up on previous
- Emotional aspect
  - very much connected with acceptance
  - of others
  - of themselves

Denizens

- EU citizens don't 'need' it — Norway/ Norwegians 'don't care'
- Overall it is not 'worth it' since it does not change much
  - Legally
  - Emotionally

Dual citizens

- Only acquired because they did not have to give up
- birth citizenship is 'essence'

3 — Rights vs feelings

g

Denizens and Naturalised Citizens' feelings about citizenship in Norway

1 Definitions of citizenship

2 Legal status vs feelings

3 Rights vs feelings

4 Legal status, rights and emotions influence on integration

3 Rights vs feelings

Citizen
- :)
  - Travel facilities
  - "priorities"
  - Social security system
  - Welfare system in general
  - State protection when abroad
  - **"you can do whatever other norwegians do"**
  - Voting in all instances ++
- :| Effects on integration/ everyday life
- :(Not allowed to hold dual citizenship (officially)
- Give it back

Denizen
- :|
  - Everything as a citizen but voting (national)
  - Voting locally
  - Work
  - Legal residence
  - "Live a normal life"
  - Pay back
- :| Effects on integration/ everyday life
- :(Voting - national level

General
- :| As status, did not change/influence much in their lives?
- Distance from family
- Children/ grandchildren: emotional connection

h

Denizens and Naturalised Citizens' feelings about citizenship in Norway

- **1** Definitions of citizenship
- **2** Legal status vs feelings
- **3** Rights vs feelings
- **4** Legal status, rights and emotions influence on integration
  - **Definition, status and rights (sub questions)**
    - Separation between legal and emotional citizenship
    - No singular definition
      - linked or not linked to citizenship
    - Membership
      - place
      - rights, duties, norms
    - Belonging
      - emotionally constructed?
    - Connection with identity
      - Norwegianess?
      - citizenship as a part of identity
    - participation and integration
      - voting
      - give back to Norway?
    - everyday life
      - practical, tool
      - safety
      - travel facilities
  - **Key aspects for integration**
    - Citizenship?
    - Language?
    - Place of birth?
    - Appearance?
    - Community?
    - integration
      - language
      - ++ discrimination and struggle
      - outsider (legal/ virtual alien?) vs insider
      - active vs passive
      - Was there any/ much difference between denizens and citizens?
  - **Feelings**
    - of becoming (Norwegian)
    - of remaining (outsider/ foreigner/ alien)
  - **Emotional citizenship and integration in Norway**
  - **Theory**
    - Integration
      - Erdal (and others, PRIO in general); Ager and Strang; Kabeer (2005); Isin (many); Brochmann; Baubock
    - Belonging/ Othering
      - Bosniak (2006); Hepworth (2016); Cresswell (2009)
    - Emotions
      - TenHouten (2007); Ho (2009); Ahmed (2004); Thien (2005) ; Marcus (2002)
  - **Context**
    - Chapter 2